

The Review of English Studies

A Quarterly Journal of
English Literature and the English Language

Editor
JOHN BUTT, B.Litt., M.A.

Secretary
LUCY HUTCHINSON

CONTENTS

Editorial Note	97
The Political Interpretation of Two Tudor Interludes: <i>Temperance and Humility and Wealth and Health.</i> By T. W. Craik	98
Pope's <i>Iliad</i> : A New Document. By Norman Callan	109
Rugby 1850: Arnold, Clough, Walrond, and <i>In Memoriam.</i> By Kathleen Tillotson	122

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

'Hippopotamus' in Old English (Norman Davis)	141
Henry Finch and Shakespeare (P. Maas)	142
'Mainly': <i>Paradise Lost</i> , XI. 519 (B. A. Wright)	143
The Jacobites, Charles Molloy, and <i>Common Sense</i> (George Hilton Jones)	144
Coleridge's <i>The Watchman</i> : Decline and Fall (S. F. Johnson)	147

REVIEWS, ETC.:

The Literature of the Anglo-Saxons, by G. K. Anderson, 149; Piers Plowman and Scriptural Tradition, by D. W. Robertson and B. F. Huppe, 150; The Lost Literature of Medieval England, by R. M. Wilson, 151; Secular Lyrics of the XIVth and XVth Centuries, ed. R. H. Robbins, 154; Polydore Vergil, by D. Hay, 155; The Tudor Books of Private Devotion, by Helen C. White, 156; Henry VI, ed. J. D. Wilson, 157; The Sources of *Much Ado About Nothing*: A Critical Study, together with the Text of

(Continued at foot of next page)

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

Single number: 10/6 net. Subscription for four consecutive numbers: 37/-

The Review of English Studies

Advisory Panel: H. S. BENNETT, M.A.; SIR EDMUND CHAMBERS, K.B.E., D.Litt., F.B.A.; R. W. CHAPMAN, D.Litt., LL.D., F.B.A.; H. B. CHARLTON, M.A., D. de Dijon, Litt.D.; UNA M. ELLIS-FERMOR, B.Litt., M.A., D.Lit.; B. IFOR EVANS, D.Lit.; DOROTHY EVERETT, M.A.; SIR WALTER GREG, Litt.D., D.Litt., LL.D., F.B.A.; SIR HERBERT GRIERSON, LL.D., Litt.D., F.B.A.; EDITH J. MORLEY, M.A.; ALLARDYCE NICOLL, M.A.; A. W. REED, D.Lit.; PERCY SIMPSON, D.Litt., Litt.D., LL.D.; KENNETH SISAM, M.A., F.B.A.; D. NICHOL SMITH, LL.D., D.Litt., F.B.A.; JAMES R. SUTHERLAND, M.A., B.Litt.; ALICE WALKER, D.Litt.; F. P. WILSON, D.Litt., F.B.A.; J. DOVER WILSON, C.H., Litt.D., D.Litt., F.B.A.; C. L. WRENN, M.A.

MSS. offered for publication, correspondence on the subject-matter of the Journal, and books for review should be addressed to The Editor, *The Review of English Studies*, c/o Clarendon Press, Oxford. Authors of articles printed will be entitled to 25 free offprints and may buy additional copies if application is made to the Editor when returning corrected proofs.

All other correspondence should be addressed to the Publisher: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, Amen House, Warwick Square, London, E.C. 4.

CONTENTS (continued)

Peter Beverley's *Ariodanto and Ieuneura*, by C. T. Prouty, 160; Shakespeare Survey 5, ed. Allardyce Nicoll, 161; The Whipper Pamphlets, ed. A. Davenport, 162; A Midnight's Trance, by William Drummond, ed. R. Ellrodt, 164; Demetrius and Enanthe, by John Fletcher, ed. M. McL. Cook and F. P. Wilson, 165; The Prayers of John Donne, sel. and ed. H. H. Umbach, 167; The Tragedy of Hoffman, by Henry Chettle, ed. H. Jenkins, 168; George Chapman, by Jean Jacquot, 169; Religion and Superstition in the Plays of Ben Jonson and Thomas Middleton, by Bertil Johansson, 171; Jonson's *Masque of Gipsies* in the Burley, Belvoir, and Windsor versions, by W. W. Greg, 172; The Life and Works of Joseph Hall, by T. F. Kinloch, 178; Next to Shakespeare: Otway's *Venice Preserv'd* and *The Orphan* and their History on the London Stage, by Aline M. Taylor, 179; A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration, by W. W. Greg. Vol. II, 180; The Seventeenth Century: Studies . . . by R. F. Jones and others, 182; English Literary Criticism: 17th and 18th Centuries, by J. W. H. Atkins, 184; The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift, ed. H. Davis. Vol. VI, 185; The Complete Works of William Diaper, ed. Dorothy Broughton, 186; The Background of Thomson's *Liberty*, by A. D. McKillop, 188; Agrarian Age: A Background for Wordsworth, by K. MacLean, 189; Elizabeth Gaskell, by A. B. Hopkins, 190; Matthew Arnold the Ethnologist, by F. E. Faverty, 191; Conrad, by D. Hewitt, 193; Die englische Sprache: ihre geschichtliche Entwicklung, by K. Brunner, 2. Bd., 194; The Oxford Dictionary of Nursery Rhymes, ed. I. and P. Opie, 195; A Dictionary of Americanisms on Historical Principles, ed. M. M. Mathews, 197; English Miscellany, ed. Mario Praz. Vol. II, 201; Summary of Periodical Literature, by A. Macdonald, 203; List of publications received, 207.

VOL. I

ON
wh
books
scholar
respon
in com
patien
Editor
large m
of ano
who an
article
Wh
summ
time h
could
ing a
will w
Th
Dr. H
him
Los A

The Review of English Studies

VOL. IV, NEW SERIES, No. 14

APRIL 1953

EDITORIAL NOTE

ONE of the most important functions of a learned journal, though one which is not always undertaken, is to provide for the review of new books in its field of study. The Editor is grateful to a large number of scholars who have willingly undertaken, without financial recompense, the responsible task of reviewing the work of their contemporaries, and who, in company with readers, authors, and publishers, have shown exemplary patience in waiting for the reviews to appear. In the present issue the Editor has attempted to make belated amends by presenting an unusually large number of reviews. But since this could be done only at the expense of another section of the journal, apologies are offered to those contributors who are thereby forced to wait a little longer for the publication of their articles.

When *The Review of English Studies* first appeared, there were few summaries of periodical literature. Today there are several, and the time has come to decide whether the space occupied by the Summary could be more profitably employed. The Editor will be helped in reaching a decision if readers who make a practice of consulting the Summary will write to him and plead for its retention.

The Editor welcomes this opportunity of expressing his gratitude to Dr. Herbert Davis and Dr. Angus Macdonald who, by deputizing for him during the months of September 1952 to January 1953, enabled him to accept an invitation to visit the University of California at Los Angeles.

J. B.

THE POLITICAL INTERPRETATION OF TWO TUDOR INTERLUDES: *TEMPERANCE AND HUMILITY AND WEALTH AND HEALTH*

By T. W. CRAIK

IT has always been recognized that the Tudor interlude was a dramatic form readily adaptable to subjects of topical interest, and that controversy in matters of politics and religion was eagerly served, often with a blend of grim invective and hearty ridicule, by the playwrights. Skelton's *Magnificence*, Bale's *King John*, Lyndsay's *The Three Estates* and the anonymous *Respublica* are the best known of these plays. The two interludes to be discussed, *Temperance and Humility* and *Wealth and Health*, are also generally agreed to belong to this same type, but about their precise themes and objects there remains much to be said. In the following pages I shall attempt to interpret these plays, and to suggest also the circumstances in which the second was performed.

Of *Temperance and Humility* only one leaf (sig. A iii) is extant, and evidently owes its survival to its use as part of a binding.¹ There are three speakers, Temperance, Humility, and Disobedience, and one of the former two begins the fragment by lamenting that virtues are falling into neglect. Disobedience rudely interrupts:

Peas whā I bydde you & come whan I call
[I] am royally prouyd of lande and of fe
Noble Disobedyence of might moost potencyall
Yet wolde I be called by name due prosperyte
Sholde I be obedyent to the superlatyfe degre
Ne yet to no creature that lyueth in londe
Sythe I am fre I wyll neuer be bonde.²

When this high-handed attitude is questioned he strikes Temperance and defies Humility's reproaches; he tells them that they cannot prevail against him and his confederates Audacity and Adversity, who dwell in 'euery order', '[In] court / in constry and in many a couent':³

For bothe spūall and tēporall foloweth our ca[ll?]
And after vs wyll do.⁴

Temperance cries:

God it amende and it be so
As for relygious I trust in dede
That obedyence with them shall go
Els may they soone stande in drede.⁵

¹ Reprinted in the Malone Society's *Collections*, iii (1909), pp. 245-6.

² ll. 3-9.

³ ll. 30, 29.

⁴ ll. 34-35.

⁵ ll. 36-39.

But Disobedience retorts that 'the poorest nowe in a place' will rebel against authority. He ignores Humility's prayer 'that euery creature may knowe his degre' and vows to stir up others to rebellion with the aid of his confederates.¹

W. W. Greg, in editing the fragment for the Malone Society, quotes Professor A. Brandl's opinion that it 'belongs to the same time and group as *Respublica*'. There was not much reason to complain of disobedience in religious matters until the succession of Mary. The allusion to the disobedient that are "royally provided of land and of fee" may refer to the nobility as enriched by church property under Henry VIII. This would point to a Catholic author.' To Greg, however, the typography indicates an earlier date, and he suggests that it was printed about 1530, possibly by de Worde.²

It is possible to reach an interpretation of the fragment which, by its consistency with this typographical evidence, makes it possible to assign the play with some confidence to the period 1534-6. The disobedience and the mismanagement of wealth, by this interpretation, are applicable not to those who bought and exploited the estates of the dissolved monasteries, but mainly to the monastic owners themselves and also to Catholic laymen of 'rebellious' tendencies. In short, the attack is not upon Oppression (alias Reformation) and his fellow extortioners in *Respublica*, but upon Sedition, Dissimulation, and Private Wealth in Bale's *King John*.

The nature of the disobedience condemned appears from Temperance's quatrain in which the 'relygious' (i.e. the monastic orders) are singled out from among Disobedience's widely distributed supporters and expressly warned that unless they show compliance they will feel retribution.³ The compliance required of them, and refused by Disobedience at the beginning of the fragment, is to the orders of the 'superlatyfe degre'—a phrase which suggests not only a king (as the holder of the highest temporal office), but more particularly Henry VIII after his assumption in 1534 of the title 'Supreme Head of the Church of England'.⁴ The passage acquires increased force if Temperance is commanding the monks to bow to Henry in matters both secular and religious.

It remains to inquire into the occasion of this disobedience to the king, and to ask why the religious orders in particular should be threatened for

¹ ll. 41, 47, 60.

² Malone Society Collections, iii (1909), p. 243. He notes that he has not found the use of a signature-title (in this case 'Tempe' at the foot of sig. A iii) in plays published by others than de Worde, Pynson, and Skot.

³ ll. 36-39, quoted opposite.

⁴ Act of Supremacy (26 Hen. VIII, c. 1), the first measure passed by the Parliament which assembled on 3 November 1534. For details of its provisions see K. Pickthorn, *Early Tudor Government: Henry VIII* (Cambridge, 1934), pp. 247-8.

their part in it. It cannot have been the Yorkshire Pilgrimage of Grace or the rising in Lincolnshire, both of which took place during the winter of 1536-7, for both sprang from the dissolution of the monasteries, while in the fragment *Disobedience* is still able to boast that he is royally provided of land and of fee and can cite 'many a couent' as the scene of his activities.¹ The referring of the play's theme to either of these rebellions is further prevented by *Disobedience's* brag that

the poorest nowe in a place
wyll lacke bothe loue and drede
And rebell in wordes they wyll a pace,

which implies that the rebellion is still verbal and has not yet been translated into action.²

Though these active rebellions against Henry did not occur till 1536-7, there was a certain amount of passive resistance to his wishes in 1534-5. On 30 March 1534 the Act of Succession barred Mary from the throne on the allegation that Henry's marriage with her mother Katherine of Aragon had been invalid. Commissioners were appointed to exact an oath of obedience to all the provisions of the Act. The news, received in England early in the following month, that the Papal conclave had upheld the validity of the marriage, and that Henry was threatened with excommunication if he ignored this ruling, aggravated the situation. Later in the year came Henry's assumption of the title of Supreme Head, followed by the Treasons Act declaring it a treasonable offence to deny this title.³

To incur a charge of treason it was necessary only to refuse to swear to these Acts. More and Fisher were sent to the Tower for refusing to agree that Henry's first marriage was invalid, though they were prepared to accept the revised succession in favour of Elizabeth. The same position was adopted, after a temporary submission, by three bodies of monks, the Carthusians of London, the Observants of Richmond, and the Brigittines of Brentford; and in 1535 the first-named was dispersed, its leading members having been executed for treason earlier in the year, as had More and Fisher.⁴ Also

¹ ll. 4, 29. This does not, of course, establish definitely that the play was written before any of these events. It could be argued that, as the fragment comes from near the beginning of the play, they might be introduced before the end, in the form of *Disobedience's* downfall, the forfeiture of his wealth, and his final destruction for refusing to accept his fate. It is probable, however, that the play was intended to prepare public opinion for government action rather than to justify the action after the event.

² ll. 41-43. I take it that a 'place' means, in this context, a religious house. In l. 46 ('And restore obedience to euery place') the word seems equivalent to social status or 'degree'.

³ See Pickthorn, pp. 233-5 (Act of Succession), 249 (Treasons Act, 26 Hen. VIII, c. 13).

⁴ See A. D. Innes, *England under the Tudors* (London, 1937 edn.), pp. 133-6, and Pickthorn, p. 258. The Greenwich Observants, who had from the first refused to submit, had already been dissolved.

in 1535 was begun the visitation of the monasteries, and the dissolution of the smaller houses followed in March of the following year.¹

It seems probable that the disobedience and verbal rebellion complained of in *Temperance and Humility* is that of refusing to swear to either or both of the Acts, and that the audience is invited to identify Disobedience's secular and clerical followers as More, Fisher, and the members of the recalcitrant monastic houses. The audience is also admonished, by the fact that Disobedience's brother is Adversity, of the danger of opposing the official policies. The close relationship of Disobedience and Adversity is, furthermore, a warning that this disobedience of the clergy and their friends brings adversity to the nation. The pretence of Disobedience to be named Due Prosperity (the stress is on the epithet) is the dramatist's gird at the undeserved wealth of the monastic establishments; a gird which had recently been set forth at length in Simon Fish's pamphlet *The Supplication for the Beggars*, and of which the character Private Wealth in Bale's *King John* supplies a dramatic example.²

The exposure, in *Temperance and Humility*, of Catholic greed and sedition, providing as it does an evident parallel with Bale's plays, suggests a further possibility. Thomas Cromwell is known to have encouraged anti-Catholic propagandists. Some of these, like Richard Taverner and John Rastell, wrote tracts; others, including Bale and Thomas Wylley (the latter a vicar in Suffolk who approached Cromwell in 1537 with an offer of his Protestant allegorical interludes) were playwrights.³ A play seemingly so much in conformity with Cromwell's policy at this time as *Temperance and Humility* may have been sponsored, or perhaps directly commissioned, by him, in an attempt to sway opinion towards his plans for the breaking of Catholic resistance.⁴

Though Brandl's remarks on the date and purpose of *Temperance and Humility* are seen to be invalidated by the subject-matter as well as by the

¹ Pickthorn, pp. 275-6 (27 Hen. VIII, c. 28).

² *Temperance and Humility*, ll. 6, 60-62 (ll. 60-62 are ambiguous as the fragment stands, but since Disobedience proposed at l. 6 to assume the name of Due Prosperity, that name is presumably intended to refer back to him here, and not to Adversity). Bale's character Private Wealth (later in the play incarnate as Cardinal Pandulphus) represents the great possessions of the Catholic Church as a whole, and not merely of the monastic orders. In *Temperance and Humility* also the attack may be on a broad front, but the dissolution (imminent or in progress) of the monasteries seems to be uppermost in the author's mind.

³ On Cromwell's patronage of Protestant propagandists, and especially of Bale, see Jesse W. Harris, *John Bale* (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, vol. xxv, no. 4, 1940), p. 27.

⁴ If these arguments in favour of 1534-6 (with 1537 as a possible though less likely date) are correct, conjecture as to the printer may be assisted. Pynson died at the beginning of 1530, and de Worde at the beginning of 1535. Skot, who is known to have published books till 1537, thus becomes the only likely printer from among the three suggested by Greg.

typographical evidence, they might be fittingly applied to *Wealth and Health*.¹ Though published in Elizabeth's reign with modifications including a patched-on prayer for her and her Council, the play can be shown to have been written not only in praise of Mary but for performance in her presence. To support this claim a detailed analysis becomes necessary.²

From the opening speech of Wealth to the audience it is plain that the message of the play is political and that basically the theme is that of *Magnificence*:

By God I thinke ye haue forgotten me
I am welth of this realme.³

He commences a conventional 'boast' and is reproved by Health, who expresses the accepted views that all wealth is in God's hand, reputation is the true wealth, ill-got wealth is evil, all wealth brings anxiety, and money cannot buy health; moreover,

Grace, heauen, nor cunning, cannot be bought
without great paine, ad good dedes wrought.⁴

There is no intention, however, that Wealth and Health should be thought seriously at odds, and so it is stated that the dispute is 'in the way of comunicacion. / And for pastyme . . .' and 'but for a recreation'. They are now joined by Liberty who begins a similar dispute which is equally incidental to the play's object.⁵

As soon as all three are in concord the real action begins, and the villainous Ill Will enters 'with some iest' (unspecified).⁶ He claims kinship with Liberty, but when he is alone reveals himself: 'Uertue I doo vtterly dispise.'⁷ He is greeted by the equally disreputable Shrewd Wit, and after rejecting the services of a Flemish gunner, Hance Beerpot (alias War),⁸ they plot to enter the employ of Wealth and his friends. After rhapsodizing on the gains they will secure by 'swering, lying and powlinge / Brybry, theft, and preuy pyking',⁹ Ill Will grows cautious:

There is one they call good remedy
In this realme, he hath geat actortty

¹ Edited in the Malone Society Reprints (1907) by Greg.

² A. Harbage, *Annals of English Drama, 975-1700* (Philadelphia, 1940), also assigns the play to the year 1554. I have not been able to discover his authority for this. Since, however, he places the play within the 'possible' limits 1553-7, and I hope to show that a date before the winter of 1554-5 is impossible and a date after it improbable, I shall set down all my evidence showing it to be a Marian play, at the risk of repeating individual points which may have been made (without my knowledge) elsewhere.

³ *Wealth and Health*, ll. 16-17: there is a satirical implication that wealth was not known in England during the previous reign (of Edward VI).

⁴ ll. 121-2: these lines, with their statement that salvation can be purchased by good works, suggest a Catholic author.

⁵ ll. 39, 40, 43: cf. l. 262, where Health says 'What neede ye to rehearse all this matter'.

⁶ l. 281, stage direction.

⁷ l. 340.

⁸ l. 399.

⁹ ll. 441-2.

He is a noble man and much worthy
 Many thinges he hach wrought
 He is called lust, discreete and indifference
 Willing to fulfil his soueraines commaundement
 He is not fraide to do right punishment
 Therfore of him I am afayde.¹

At present, however, they are free, and as their prospective masters come in they ostentatiously make a 'deuout orison':

Now Jesu saue Welth, Helth, and Lybertie.²

The plan succeeds and, dropping the revealing epithets to their names, they acquire high office: 'All our houshoulde guide ye must'.³

No sooner have the rogues departed singing than Good Remedy appears, to be royally welcomed by Wealth and his friends. He tells how he has worked for their continuance in England, and approves the riches of noblemen, prelates, merchants, lawyers and franklins, and the bravery of English soldiers. As they go, their servants return and by their disrespectful behaviour incur Remedy's suspicion. Next these are shown explaining to their employers how they are conducting the household. Remedy has advised the golden mean, but the vices both make damaging statements, Ill Will saying that all is wasteful revel, and Shrewd Wit that strict parsimony is observed:

A man may breke his neck as lyghtly
 As his fast in your kechin, or seller truly.⁴

Though they save their faces for a time, their downfall is at hand. Remedy returns to address the audience. He has been 'chosen' to amend faults:

yf any mans conscience here doth grudge or shame
 Hauing in him self remorse, & mendes in tyme & space
 I am good remedy, and god is ful of mercy and grace.⁵

His first reform is to expel drunken Hance, now a shoemaker and brewer:

There is to mainy allaunts in this reale, but now I
 good remedy haue so prouided that English men shall lyue the better dayly⁶
 by the removal of these crafty competitors. Health now enters 'ifect both
 body & soul', and tells how Wealth

is fallen in decay, and necessitie
 By wast & war, thorow yll wyll and shrewdwit,
 And lybertie is kept in duraunce and captiuite. . . .⁷

Even as he relates their sins, the vices enter, Shrewd Wit in dread of 'him

¹ ll. 449-56 (l. 450, read 'great authority', 452 'hath', 453 'just', 'indifferent').

² ll. 463, 465.

³ l. 497.

⁴ ll. 688-9.

⁵ ll. 742-4.

⁶ ll. 760-2 (l. 760, read 'aliens', 'realm').

⁷ ll. 785, 807-9.

that weres the red cap',¹ but Ill Will confident that he has made Remedy powerless by slander. Remedy reveals his power, however, by packing them off to prison, with the comment

I am halfe ashamed, that long it hath ben sayd
That noble men by such wretches hath ben deceiued.²

The conclusion is now reached. Remedy draws the moral that

The ende of yl wyl and shrewd wyt is but shame
Though they reygne a while, wrongfully and vniust
yet truth wyll appeare and their misdedes blame
Then wronge is subdued, and good remedy tane
Though falsehod cloke, and hide his matters all
Craft wyll out and disceite wyll haue a fall.³

He restores the dupes to their former prosperity, and they praise him:

wealth. Now let vs al thāke god y^t good remedy hath sende
Trust to hym only for his grace and goodnes
we axe forgiuenes of our trespas I trust we wil amēd
And cleane forsake syn, foly, and vnthriftines
th[us] we wil here cōclude, soueraine of your graciousnes
we besech you to remyt our negligence, & misbehauor
There we haue sayd amis, we cōmit al to your fauor

Health. And for your preseruacion hartely we wyl pray
your realme to increase, with ioy and tranquility
That welth, helth & liberty, may continue here alway
By the ouersight and aide of him that is good remdy
which willingly doth his deuer, vnder your acortorie
As parte here apereth your purpose to maintaine
God continue his goodnes, that longe he may riagne

Remdi. Jesu preserue quene Elizabeth y^t noble pricis worthy
Jesu routinue her helth long for to endure
Jesu indue her w vertue grace & honour
Jesu maintaine the lords of y^e cōsuel to execute good remedi euer
Jesu spede and helpe al them gods honour to further
Jesu increase the comunaltie to prosper and doo wel.

FINIS.⁴

¹ l. 834.

² ll. 896-7.

³ ll. 932-7. Compare *Respublica* (ed. L. A. Magnus, London, 1905), ll. 23-28:

But thoughte these vices by cloked collusyon
And by counterfaicte Names, hidden their abusion,
Do Reigne for a while to comon weales preiudice,
pervertinge all right and all ordre of true Iustice,
yet tyme trieth all and tyme bringeth truth to lyght,
that wronge may not ever still reigne in place of right.

⁴ ll. 945-65 (l. 958, read 'reign', 960 'continue').

Discussion of the meaning of this play can fittingly begin with this final passage, from which it is apparent that Wealth's address to Good Remedy ends with the first quatrain. The 'souveraine' then addressed is not Remedy but Mary, who is witnessing the play; and the negligence, misbehaviour, and slips of speech are those not of the characters but of the actors. The irregular lines on Elizabeth are wholly superfluous.

If Mary, then, is the sovereign, who is Remedy? All the evidence points decisively to Cardinal Pole. There is personal portraiture at its clearest in his red cap and perhaps also in his gown which Ill Will says he would gladly pawn.¹ Further details confirm the identification. He is a nobleman in authority under the Queen.² He denies, when asked by the vices, that he lives 'in this place', alluding presumably to his long exile.³ He has been slandered by Ill Will, as was Pole (in Catholic eyes) by Bale, Hall, Becon, and other Protestant writers.⁴ His offer to the audience of God's mercy and grace may represent Pole's absolution of the nation on 30 November 1554. Most important of all, the name and mission of Pole were popularly associated with social reform. John Elder, the chronicler of his return to England, notes approvingly that all things formerly disordered 'begin now to cum in rule and square'.⁵ Furthermore, although Starkey's now famous *Dialogue between Pole and Lupset* was not in print, it was extant (presumably among the royal effects), and it is not impossible that the dramatist knew of it. The introductory arguments of the play, though traceable to many another source, are to be found in 'Pole's' discussion of the nature and causes of prosperity,⁶ and it is the intention of 'Pole' to investigate the

¹ ll. 834, 625-8. 'Red cap' is a traditional synonym for 'Cardinal'. Cf. *Rede me and be nott wrothe* (Arber's English Reprints, xiv, 1871), p. 118, where 'the man in the red cappe' is Wolsey. A prophecy current in 1512 was that after the misery caused by 'one with a Red Cap' (i.e. Wolsey) 'the land should by another Red Cap [i.e. Pole] be reconciled or else be brought to utter destruction' (M. H. Dodds, 'Political Prophecies in Henry VIII's reign', *M.L.R.*, xi, 277). It can be presumed that Good Remedy's gown as well as his cap was red.

² ll. 449-56 (quoted above). By 1555 the Venetian ambassador could write 'It may in truth be said that he is both king and prince' (*State Papers, Venetian*, vi, 2, 1070: cf. also W. Schenk, *Cardinal Pole* (London, 1950), p. 132).

³ ll. 669-71. Bale, *Three Laws* (ed. A. Schroeder in *Anglia*, v, 1882), ll. 2045-6. Hall, *Chronicle* (ed. Ellis, 1809), p. 828: 'that Archetraitor'. Becon, *Works* (ed. J. Ayre, 1843), i, 233: he 'danceth now like a traitor in a carnal's [sic] weed at Rome, and as a shameless monster abasheth not to write, Roma est mihi patria'.

⁴ J. Elder, *The Copie of a letter sent in to Scotland*, &c. (1555), sig. F i verso.

⁵ Starkey, *Dialogue* (in *England in the Reign of King Henry VIII*, J. M. Cowper and S. J. Herrtage, E.E.T.S., 1878), pp. 34-39. 'Pole' takes as his theme the national welfare; to discover the cause of this he analyses the reasons for national prosperity, p. 32. Health is necessary, wealth must support the benefits of health, and to govern and maintain both virtue is needed. This third point emerges from the debates in *Wealth and Health*. 'Liberty' does not appear in 'Pole's' scheme and it is perhaps relevant to note that his arguments in the play are short and that Health views this prolonging of the debate as needless.

realm's decay and devise 'the remedy and meane to restore the commyn wele agayne'.¹

As for Ill Will and Shrewd Wit, it is not difficult to show in them the vices of *Respublica* once more. Their plot to rob Wealth, and their pretence that all is being prudently managed, closely recall that play. Both interludes are illustrated by Pole's statement to Parliament on 27 November 1554, that the 'reformation' was the fruit of avarice, and that 'there seemed by these chaunges to rise a gret face of riches and gayne, which in profe cam to great misery and lacke'.² The vices' unlucky and self-contradictory accounts of their stewardship pillory on the one side the increased wealth of the greedy 'gross gospellers' through the spoliation of the monasteries and on the other their abandonment of hospitality. Miles Huggarde's contemporary exposure of the same abuses employs the identical proverb here given to Shrewd Wit: 'A man myght as well haue broke his necke as his faste at their houses'.³

There remains Hance Beerpot. As War, the mercenary gunner whose services are refused and who claims to have brought wealth to Flanders,⁴ he presents considerable difficulty. Professor C. F. Tucker Brooke suggested that he represented the wasteful war in Flanders during 1557-8, but it is hard to see how that made Flanders rich, though it doubtless made England poor.⁵ More probably Hance represents any Flemish mercenary whom it cost money to hire, perhaps for Henry's wars. As a cobbler and brewer he appears to have more demonstrable significance. A royal proclamation on 17 February 1553/4 banished all aliens who could not produce satisfactory credentials, and this seems to be figured in Good Remedy's banishment of Hance.⁶ Admittedly Pole was not responsible for the proclamation, but the reform was so conveniently coincidental with his return that the dramatist chose to pretend that he was.

¹ Starkey, *Dialogue*, p. 26.

² J. Elder, *Copie of a letter, &c.*, sig. D v verso.

³ Anon. (Miles Huggarde), *The Displaying of the Protestantes, &c.* (1556), fol. 77 verso. For the animus in *Wealth and Health* against the hypocrisy of the misrulers, see the vices' ostentatious prayer, l. 465, and the infection of Health in soul as well as in body, l. 785.

⁴ ll. 389-428.

⁵ C. F. T. Brooke, *The Tudor Drama* (London, 1912), p. 107. Needless to say, this would make the whole part of Hance an interpolation, which would be hard to justify from the text.

⁶ See R. Steele, *Tudor and Stuart Proclamations, 1485-1715* (Oxford, 1910), i. 46 (no. 445): (Many evilly-disposed persons have fled into the country for heresy, murder, treason, robbery, &c., and stir up heresy and disorder. Any alien resident in the kingdom, whether preacher, printer, bookseller or other artificer, or of whatsoever calling, not being a denizen or merchant known, or servant to an Ambassador, is to leave the realm within twenty-four days on pain of imprisonment and confiscation of goods, and of being delivered to his natural Prince. All mayors, &c., to arrest any alien found in the realm after that date.) There was only one other proclamation expelling aliens, in 1541. Reference to the 1554 proclamation is made by the French traveller Stephen Perlin in 1558 (in F. Grose, *The Antiquarian Repertory* (1775-84), i. 229).

INTERPRETATION OF TWO TUDOR INTERLUDES 107

The theme of the play, in short, is that of *Respublica*, with additional attacks on alien mercenaries and artificers, and with Pole (as Remedy) in the reforming role discharged by Mary (as Nemesis) in the earlier play. The date of composition, since the play deals with events up to the end of 1554 and is clearly designed to provide topical compliments to Mary and Pole, can be conjectured with a good deal of probability as the end of 1554 or the beginning of 1555.

The inference that the play received its first performance at court in Mary's presence, which has been drawn from the concluding speeches, is borne out by other factors. Wealth's rebuke to the audience for their lack of interest in his arrival—'What ayles you all thus to syt dreaming'¹—with its implication of a seated audience, suggests a court performance.² More important are the reasons for associating the play with the royal interlude players. It is clear that its actors were accomplished musicians. The play opens with 'a balet of two partes' sung by Wealth and Health;³ when Liberty joins them he also is given a song before he speaks;⁴ Shrewd Wit and Hance Beerpot both enter with songs, the latter singing 'a dutche song' (probably in praise of drink);⁵ and when Ill Will and Shrewd Wit are engaged by Wealth and his friends, they give a special performance to ingratiate themselves:

wytte. Now and it please ye, wyll ye here any synging

Therein I tell you I am somewhat connyng

ye shall heare and ye list.

liberty. Syr I pray you sing and ye can

wyll. Now wil I begin like a lusty bloud. thā thei sing & go out⁶

The size, as well as the musicianship, of the company is an indication of their identity. On the title-page of the play is the statement 'Foure may easely play this Play', a falsehood for which the publisher is evidently responsible. In fact five actors are required,⁷ and the motive of the statement is presumably to sell the printed play to a company of actors smaller than that for which the author inconsiderately designed it. If this original company were the royal interlude players, they would have no difficulty in performing the seven parts, as their number was seven after 1552 and did

¹ l. 10.

² Compare the audience of *The Cobbler's Prophecy*, invited to 'sit and see', l. 37, and Sir E. K. Chambers's comment on the phrase, *The Elizabethan Stage* (Oxford, 1923), iii. 35.

³ ll. 1-3, stage direction.

⁴ l. 196, stage direction.

⁵ ll. 349, 389, stage directions.

⁶ ll. 515-19.

⁷ See W. J. Lawrence, 'The Practice of Doubling', in *Pre-Restoration Stage Studies* (Cambridge, Mass., 1927), pp. 47-48.

not sink to four till after 1556.¹ The entire company would probably be in residence at court for the period of Christmas and New Year, to which period in 1554-5 the play may well be assigned on account of its topical interest.²

¹ E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, ii. 83.

² The absence of any reference to Philip, who was resident in England from 25 July 1554 to 4 September 1555, need not invalidate this conclusion. The fact that Mary alone is addressed ('Souveraine of your graciousnes / We besech you to remyt our negligence', &c.) can be explained by her position as queen regnant. Nevertheless, a play performed at court before the Queen and her consort would be sure to contain compliments to them both; and the probability is that the publisher or other reviser of 1558 made way for his own lines about Elizabeth by suppressing other lines in which Philip was included in the original prayer.

TH
sh
volum

The
VIII of
contain
the bi
attach
either
of the
pages
some

The
spond
of the
'page
runs o

On
script

Ce
celuy
y trou
le jour
mais s
être d
Voyez

¹ TH
This is
Iliad,

² TH
Le Gr
de Siv
and th
these p

³ TH
and th

⁴ Pr
He m
attacki
possib

R.E

POPE'S *ILIAD*: A NEW DOCUMENT

By NORMAN CALLAN

THERE has recently come to light in Paris a collection of the proof-sheets of the first eight books of Pope's *Iliad*,¹ bound as a single volume and corrected by Pope himself.²

The volume comprises the complete text of the translation of Books I-VIII of Homer's *Iliad*, together with the Observations and ancillary matter contained in volumes i and ii of the edition.³ There are some mistakes in the binding of the ancillary matter, but not much significance can be attached to this beyond saying that whoever bound up these proofs was either careless or else unfamiliar with the order of the edition.⁴ The size of the paper used was apparently the same as that in the edition, but the pages have been heavily cropped to fit the binding, with the result that some of the marginal corrections have been mutilated.

The pagination presents certain peculiarities. In Books I-IV it corresponds with that of the first volume of the edition: that is to say, the text of the translation begins on 'page one', and the notes again on a fresh 'page one', for each book. In Books V-VIII the pagination of the proofs runs consecutively from 322 to 640, that of the edition from 1 to 306.

On the inside of the front cover of the volume is the following manuscript note, presumably written by the donor himself:

Ce livre a un avantage inappréciable, et qui croîtra de siècle en siècle; c'est celui d'être un assemblage de feuilles corrigées de la main même de Pope; on y trouve, entre autres variantes, quelques leçons primitives qui n'ont jamais vu le jour, puisque l'édition n'a point été tirée sur ces leçons primitives imprimées, mais sur les corrections de l'auteur; et comme ces corrections sont démontrées être de la main même de Pope, tout cela est infiniment curieux à considérer. Voyez entre autres exemples les deux premiers vers de la page 358, L. V; Le

¹ *The Iliad of Homer. Translated by Mr. Pope*, London, 1715 (vol. i), 1716 (vol. ii), &c. This is referred to as 'the edition' throughout the following pages. Vol. i covers Homer's *Iliad*, I-IV, vol. ii covers V-VIII.

² The book, which is in the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, was discovered by Mme Simonne Le Gal when engaged in collecting materials for a bibliographical study of Poinset de Sivry, who presented it to the library in 1777. It is thanks to Mme Le Gal's kindness and that of the Curator of the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal that I have been able to examine these proofs and to give the brief account of them which follows.

³ The reproduction of the Farnese bust and the maps in vol. i, and the map of Troy and the Errata page in vol. ii are wanting.

⁴ Probably careless; for the most likely person to have done this would be Pope himself. He made a collection of the manuscript of the translation and another of the pamphlets attacking it. That he should have preserved the proofs in the same way seems at least possible.

quatrième vers de la page 366, même livre; les vers 606, et 647, encore du même livre; et une infinité d'autres variantes manuscrites, et autographes de Pope. Sivry est en quelque sorte confus de se trouver fortuitement en possession d'une perle isolée, qu'il ne sait avec quoy assortir. Il croit remplir les intentions de Pope lui même, en suppliant Monseigneur le Marquis de Paulmy, de mettre cette rareté à sa vraie place; c'est à dire parmi les autres raretés de sa Bibliothèque. C'est un hommage qu'il le prie d'accepter.

17 fevrier 1777

Across the heading of the first page of Names of Subscribers has been written the name I. N. Chevert in a hand that suggests a period earlier than that of de Sivry's note.

The manuscript corrections are very numerous throughout the entire volume. They fall into two distinct classes: (a) those which are strictly proof-corrections, that is to say rectifications of printer's errors, and (b) author's corrections, ranging from emendations of a single word to cancellations and revisions of quite long passages. Those belonging to class (a) are, of course, plentiful all the way through: those belonging to class (b) are to be found only in the last four books—that is to say, the books contained in the second volume of the edition.

Apart from one or two clear exceptions, it seems beyond all reasonable doubt that the revision was carried out by Pope himself.¹ Of these exceptions the most interesting are the notes written on a blank half-page at the end of Book v:²

Leave this Space for a Copper Plate.³

? if a printers Ornament will not do well enough here Such a one as ends a Book in *Trivia*.

To Mr Lintot

Mr Pope is not at home—There are very few Erratas in this sheet.

I believe the Common Printers Ornament will not please.

Y^r Svt. C. Jervas

The first two notes are in the same handwriting, which differs from that of Jervas's note to Lintot. At the foot of page 513 the same hand seems to have written the terse injunction 'more Copy', and it is probable that this

¹ An expert's opinion is awaited; but the following points would seem to settle the matter. (i) The handwriting closely resembles that of the Malet MS. of Pope's 'Homer' and of other known Pope manuscripts. (ii) Many of the corrections are of a kind which only the author could have made. (iii) De Sivry's statement is quite definite (for what it may be worth); and Jervas's note to Lintot (on this page) implies that Pope himself would have corrected the proofs had he been 'at home'. (iv) The economical style of the corrections suggests Pope.

² Proofs, p. 445.

³ The edition has no colophon here: only a ruling and the catchword.

note and the first two on page 445 are all from Lintot himself. Jervas's hand seems to have been responsible for one or two small corrections: at line 448 in Book VII there is a cancelled marginal query 'Atridæ' (for 'Atrides' in the text), which looks like his; and at the penultimate line of Book VIII there is a similarly queried but uncanceled note 'o'er their heaps of corn'. This has been incorporated into the text in Pope's hand to replace the weaker 'fed with strength'ning Corn'. Jervas could hardly have chosen a more likely passage in which to signalize his share in the translation.¹

As an example of proof-correcting in the early eighteenth century the volume is of considerable bibliographical interest. Pope, as one would expect from his manuscripts, is precise in his reading and economical in his methods of correction. In the 'Essay on Homer' (Book I), we find him putting the printer right about hyphens: 'concer-/ning' is corrected to 'concern-/ing', and 'contrac-/ting' to 'contract-/ing'. In the 'Geographical Table' which follows Book II he has trouble with diphthongs—e.g. 'P_hthia/h', 'P_hthiotis/h'. This difficulty persists in editions printed during Pope's lifetime, and may have been due to his own uncertain spelling of Greek names. There is an example—the only one I have noted—of his use of Greek script in Observation xlv of Book VI. He begins by setting the compositor right rather laboriously letter by letter: Σηληνφβλφτφς χ, Αρεμ-|δοβλντος is marked in the text and marginally corrected ε|θ|ο|γ|ε. Then he seems to lose patience and writes the words out in full, correctly spelled, but omitting the accents. Line-numbering goes wrong (as it was still apt to do in the editions) at line 460 of Book VII: Pope's marginal comment has unfortunately been mutilated by the cropping of the page, but his manuscript numbering continues for the next forty lines. His method with typographical faults can be seen from such marginal comments as 'in the common letter' (for 'Roman'), and 'the letter set awry here' (for a dropped letter). The corrections as a whole give the impression of a man who worked rapidly and knew just what was required.

From this brief account we may now turn to one or two points of interest which the discovery of the volume raises.

The most tantalizing question is that of the volume's provenance. In spite of the fact that he speaks of 'fulfilling Pope's intentions', both the date of his note and the fact that he came by the volume *fortuitement* make it unlikely that de Sivry was personally acquainted with Pope. One tempting speculation is that it may have some connexion with Anne Dacier, the *savante* who had been so tart on Pope's 'Preface', and with whom Pope is

¹ This is the famous 'moonlight scene'. It is full of painters' terms, and bears obvious relations to Rembrandt's *The Night Watch*. That Jervas should have helped Pope with it would not be at all unlikely.

said to have corresponded: but guesses of this kind will have to await the findings of Mme Le Gal.¹ In the meantime there are other questions.

One of these concerns whatever help is to be had in solving that perennial mystery 'the affair of the rival translators'. As reconstructed by Professor Sherburn the story of the publication of Pope's first volume is briefly this.² The book had been promised for May 1715; when, however, Tickell appeared as a rival translator, Pope issued an advertisement advancing the date of his own publication by two months. In this way, Professor Sherburn supposes, he hoped to bluff Tickell into publishing first, and thus have the chance of correcting any faults in his own work by the light of his rival's superior learning. But Tickell was the better poker-player—or at least he was in a stronger position to 'see' his opponent, and as a result Pope's translation hung fire until he was eventually forced to publish on 6 June, a month after the date originally promised. Tickell's version followed within a week.

This interpretation of the facts, although so persuasive because apparently so typical of Pope's activities, has always seemed to me open to question. I cannot understand what advantage Pope would have gained by the schoolboy trick of letting his opponents have first knock on a good wicket, simply for the sake of seeing how many runs he would have to make. It is true that if he could have had a preview of Tickell's version he might have been able to put right one or two doubtful passages in his own rendering of Book I,³ though even here he could hardly have done much without obvious plagiarism. But what of Books II, III, and IV? Were the errors of Book I to have been rectified with the help of Tickell's rendering, and those of the remaining books left to look after themselves? It would have been all too easy for his enemies to spot what had happened and take advantage of it. Pope's best course was surely to publish first, thereby making the most of the public's uncloyed expectation. He knew that his volume was likely to be an altogether more substantial affair than Tickell's, and it may be that by advancing his own date of publication he hoped to stampede the opposition into print before they had time to reinforce their somewhat meagre counterstroke. But whatever the reasons, it has always seemed to me more probable than not that the *Post Boy* advertisement was genuine, and that Pope intended to publish in March if he could.

For this view two facts which I have already mentioned in connexion with the Arsenal volume now seem to offer some support. The first is

¹ She has now propounded some possibilities in *Le Bulletin du Bibliophile*, No. 1, 1952.

² *The Early Career of Alexander Pope* (Oxford, 1934), pp. 125 ff.

³ Actually Pope did something rather like this when he altered the opening lines of Book I to a version nearer Tickell's for the second edition. But this was in 1720, when Pope could afford to be generous.

the complete absence of any tinkering by Pope with the printed text of the first four books. This is a surprising state of affairs, when we compare the evidence of very copious tinkering to be found in the next four. If, however, the printing of the translation had been pressed forward so as to be ready two months ahead of schedule, the explanation would be clear enough.

That something of this kind may have happened seems to be indicated by the second fact—the curious way the pages of the first four books are numbered, both in the proofs and in the edition. In all of them, as has already been said, the pagination of both text and Observations begins at 1, an arrangement which would seem to imply that text and notes were set up separately, and perhaps at considerable intervals of time. I would suggest that what may have happened was that the text of the translation was already being printed in January, but that, because Broome's contributions from Eustathius were not forthcoming, the printing of the notes was delayed, perhaps for quite a long time, and had to be done eventually as an entirely separate job. Pope's letter to Broome of 29 January lends some weight to this suggestion. 'I could be glad', he writes, 'if you have done any part, that I had the papers by the first opportunity sent to Lintot, the first volume being now in the press.'¹ This, if Pope has not cooked the date, seems to imply that Broome was a very long way behindhand, and if so it would afford another possible reason for the absence of tinkering with the text in the proofs. As we shall see later, there are one or two instances in the second volume where the information contained in a note seems to have been the cause of a radical alteration in Pope's rendering.² If Broome's notes had been ready in time it is not unlikely that we should have found something similar happening in the first volume. If, on the other hand, by the time the Observations were available, the text of the translation was already in its final printed form, the absence of any such happenings would be explained. Lastly, in the way of supplementary evidence, it may be worth noting that the presence of frequent discrepancies in the first volume between the catch-lines of the Observations and the form of words in the text tallies with just such a situation.³

The facts offered here are perhaps open to other interpretations: they do, however, suggest (to me at any rate) that Pope's proclaimed intention

¹ *The Works of Alexander Pope*, edited by Elwin and Courthope (London, 1871-89), viii. 124. This edition is referred to hereafter as E-C.

² See below, p. 117.

³ The question of whether Broome was responsible for the Observations, and not merely for the references to Eustathius, does not affect the argument and cannot be pursued here. Pope may have sent him his Observations in draft form, using an early version of his text for the catch-lines, and by the time Broome had done his part there may have been no time left for revisions.

of publishing in March may have been perfectly genuine, and not a matter of bluff at all.¹

But historical detection, however absorbing, is not as important as the light which a document may throw on the working of a poet's mind, and it is in this respect that the proofs are likely to be of greatest value. We may regret that Dr. Johnson, who first discovered the fascination of comparing Pope's manuscript version² with the printed text, and was only able to restrain his flow of instances by reflecting that he was not writing solely for philosophers and poets, should never have set eyes on the Arsenal volume. Johnson presupposed an 'intermediate copy';³ but now 'Transcripts on transcripts, proofs upon proofs arise', and the first thing that emerges from a study of several passages is that his supposition, though sound, is inadequate. Pope's friend Thomas Dancastle transcribed the *Iliad* for the press;⁴ and presumably the proofs now yield us a complete copy of this transcription.⁵ But that the version which he transcribed was not always the one to be found in the Homer MS. is strikingly illustrated by the following instance:

Homer MS., f. 84 v.

Prostrate before the sacred shrine they fall	
With lifted hands and loud for mercy call.	
	ye shining Veil displays
The Veil, the Priestess self . . . conveys	
Then placed at Pallas feet	
	on Minervas
Placed at ye goddess Knees & thus she prayd	
Hear sacred Pallas	Goddess divine thou ever dreadful Maid
O Goddess most divine! redoubted	Divinest Goddess
Goddess of Goddesses! O Pallas aid	Venerable Maid
	Oh dreadful Maid
	Minerva
Troys safe defence	victorious Pallas aid
	unconquerd
	thou ever dreadful Maid

¹ One is still left with the problem of why the publication was so long delayed. I can only surmise that Broome's notes may have been very late indeed. There may also be some truth in the story of the printed sheets that were such an unconscionable time a-drying (E-C, vi. 227).

² B.M. MSS. Add. 4807-9. Usually called the 'Homer MS.' All references are to Add. 4807.

³ *Lives*, ed. G. B. Hill (Oxford, 1905), iii. 119.

⁴ E-C, ix. 489.

⁵ Several leaves of the transcription are preserved in MS. Add. 4809: Pope has used the backs for his version of the *Odyssey*.

Proofs, vi. 374 ff.

uplifted and imploring eyes,
 With Hands ~~before the sacred Shrine they fall~~
 They fill the Dome with supplicating cries
~~With Hands advanc'd, and loud for Mercy call:~~
 then
 The Priestess self the shining Veil displays
 Plac'd on *Minerva's* Knees, and thus she prays,
 Oh awful Goddess! ever-dreadful
~~Goddess of Goddesses! Oh dreadful Maid~~
 Troy's strong Defence, unconquer'd Pallas aid.

It is a beguiling but unlikely theory that Pope left his long-suffering amanuensis to take his pick of the alternatives offered in the manuscript: more probably he indicated his choice in whatever communication accompanied the foul papers. The reduplication of 'with hands' in the first line of this passage offers scope for speculation. Had Dancastle for once slipped up or had Pope forgotten to cancel the earlier version? Perhaps Pope was using these two words as a mnemonic for the final form, which was lurking in the back of his mind, but had not fully crystallized.

Whatever may have happened in this particular instance, we have in the excerpt as a whole a remarkable example of Pope 'perfecting his utterance'.¹ One wonders whether his concern over the invocation of Pallas arose from a desire to avoid an effect like that of the ill-fated *O Sophonisba! Sophonisba O!*: certainly it was not due to overmuch pondering on Homer's text, for most of his attempts have little or nothing to do with the Greek.² Nevertheless, in this case at least, Homer comes to his assistance. 'Troy's strong Defence' is not only an immense improvement on anything earlier, it is a pretty close rendering of the Greek *ῥυσίπτολι*—so close, indeed, that the cynical might wonder whether it was Pope's own. For the student of Pope the poet, however, as distinct from Pope the classical scholar, the remarkable thing about this passage, and about so many others in which we see the same process at work, is the immeasurable superiority of the final version over everything that has led up to it. One gets the impression that the ultimate formulation, so compact and assured, must have always existed subliminally in Pope's mind, and that the false starts are mere literary doodling until it rises to full consciousness. Obviously this is not

¹ See Sherburn, 'Pope at Work', in *Essays on the Eighteenth Century Presented to David Nichol Smith* (Oxford, 1945), p. 62.

² Cf. Homer, *Iliad*, vi. 305: *ποτνὴ Ἀθηναίη, ῥυσίπτολι δια θεῶν*. One odd inconsistency in this passage is Pope's treatment of the word *πέπλον* which he here renders 'veil'. At line 113 and again at 340 he translated it as 'carpet', which he revised in the proof to 'mantle'. This is eclecticism indeed. All three meanings are possible, but hardly when applied to the same object.

quite what happened; but it certainly describes the effect on the reader of the finished product.

As might be expected of the author (or part-author) of the *Peri Bathous*, one of Pope's chief concerns was to avoid flatness. Usually this appears, if at all, in his first drafts and has been raised to a sufficient elevation by the time the proof-stage has been reached. Yet even here he is on the alert:

Proofs, v. 399 ff.

Next rushing to the *Dardan* Spoil, detains
The heav'nly Coursers with the flowing Manes.
These in proud Triumph to the Fleet convey'd
~~These order'd to the Fleet, are sent aboard~~
No longer now a *Trojan* Lord obey'd.
~~And change their *Trojan* for a *Grecian* Lord.~~

Pope wanted to heighten both the magnificence of Diomedes's exploit and the pathos of the coursers bereaved of their Trojan master: but if we turn to his first attempts, other things emerge which are of credit to Pope as an honest translator. The Homer MS. has the same version as the unrevised proof at this point, but below this version stands the cancelled couplet:

~~Then gives command to send the steeds aboard
& change their *Trojan* for a *Grecian* Lord~~

Obviously this is not only flat, but a trifle absurd, since Diomedes would have given no command about changing masters after the change had already been effected. For all that it is much closer to the Greek δῶκε δὲ Διήπυλῳ . . . νηυσὶν ἐπὶ γλαφυρῇσιν ἐλαυνέμεν. It preserves, too, what is certainly an intentional antithesis in the Homeric line between *Τρώων* and *Ἀχαιούς*.¹ Thus, whether we approve of them or not, the considerations which led Pope to his final version are clear enough; and it is pleasing to find that an insufficient understanding of the Greek was not among them.

Somewhat different considerations seem to have been at work in the following passage from the same book:

Homer MS., f. 56 r.

From Meges force ye swift Pedæus fled
Antenor's Son whom fair Theano bred
~~And reared as~~ offspring from a foreign bed
Yet fair Theano, to approve
Her faith, had nursed her with a
Mothers love

his Consort's care to prove
Yet not too mean Theano's
Theanos him
She kindly nursed kept well
with a
Ye stranger mother's love

¹ Cf. Homer, *Iliad*, v. 323 f.:

καλλίτριχας ἵππους
ἐξέλασε Τρώων μετ' εὐκνήμιδας Ἀχαιοίς.

Proofs, v. 91 ff.

From *Meges'* Force the swift *Pedæus* fled,
Antenor's Offspring from a foreign Bed,
 Spouse *Theano* heav'nly fair
 Whose gen'rous ~~Consort~~, ~~Theano~~ the fair
 Nurs'd the young Stranger with a Mother's Care.

The proof version has been reached by means of patching from the MS., the only innovations being 'gen'rous' in the third line and 'young' in the fourth. As usual the MS. shows Pope a good deal nearer the actual Greek than in his final version. Most of his marginal alternatives are clearly attempts at rendering *χαριζομένη πόσει* ϕ , attempts which he finally compresses into the single epithet 'gen'rous'.¹ The rather obscure 'Yet not too mean' suggests that in his first draft he is trying to include antiquarian information in his rendering. This is a trick which Pope was not above borrowing from Chapman; but whereas Chapman's interpolations are usually concerned with ethical points, Pope's are often snippets of information culled from Eustathius or Dionysius Halicarnassus by his industrious friends. In this instance, however, he wisely leaves the matter to a long note.² The rendering must now have seemed satisfactory; but, unfortunately, in solving the problem of how to turn *χαριζομένη πόσει* ϕ he failed to notice that he had been forced to stress *Theano* wrong, and so in the proof he has to alter the phrasing once more. The result, though it passes muster, and may even have seemed preferable to Pope, since it manages to suggest a connexion between the Greek *δία* and the notion of deity, is not so strong as the earlier version. It does, however, illustrate clearly Pope's remarkable alertness in matters of detail.

Another instance of such alertness, though for a different reason, appears in Book VIII:³

Proofs, VIII. 550 f.

all-conscious Eyes the
 He whose ~~broad Eyes the subject~~ World behold,
 Eternal Thunderer
 The Majesty of Gods &c.

Pope's first rendering seems a pretty close approximation to the Greek,

¹ This is the kind of thing a reader who does not know either the Greek or the MS. is apt to miss in thinking the adjective a mere conventional expletive.

² Book v, Obs. x. On *Theano*, and the social status of bastards in antiquity. This is one occasion where the information in a note may have altered a rendering in the text (see p. 113 above). At least part of this note was probably written after the translation of Book VIII had been completed.

³ Homer, *Iliad*, VIII. 443 f.:

αὐτὸς δὲ χρύσειον ἐπὶ θρόνον εὐρύσπα Ζεὺς
 ἔζετο, τῷ δ' ὑπὸ ποσσὶ μέγας πελαμίζετ' Ὀλύμπος.

and it is not easy to see why he should have wanted to change it until one recalls that he had used almost exactly the same form of words to cover a similar situation some five hundred lines earlier:

Thence his broad Eye the subject World surveys . . .¹

Presumably Pope had forgotten this until he saw his revises, and he made the alteration accordingly. What will perhaps seem odd to anyone who knows the Greek better than he knows Pope is that he should have chosen to make the alteration in the second passage rather than the first; for it is in the later passage of Homer that the words *εὐρύοπα* ('broad Eyes') and *ὑπὸ ποσσὶ* ('subject') occur; but this again is one of Pope's little habits. Where the more or less conventional attributes of gods and heroes are concerned he seems to keep a stock supply of lines and phrases which he uses with the arbitrariness of a Humpty Dumpty—or indeed of a Homer. Thus one may sometimes think that he has completely misunderstood a line of Homer, only to come across it satisfactorily rendered a good way farther on. It may be that this arose from his custom of getting passages of Homer by heart before translating them, with the result that frequently recurring lines sometimes became misplaced. This, in a translator, though undoubtedly a sin, seems to me a very venial one. Indeed in some ways it reflects credit on Pope, for he not only recognizes the scene instinctively, but instinctively uses the appropriate Homeric phrases. No doubt there are people who would have preferred him to keep an eye on the passage he was supposed to be translating. Perhaps they are right. Here at any rate it may be conceded that Pope's emendation, if not strictly accurate, conveys very adequately the effect of the passage. That is a conclusion to which one continually recurs in the study of this translation.

On the whole, when the proofs are taken in conjunction with the Homer MS., the light they throw on Pope's knowledge of Greek is in his favour. There is one passage, however, where for once he seems to deserve the charges of contemptuousness and irresponsibility brought against him by 'Hesiod' Cooke.² On most occasions when the meaning of Homer is in dispute Pope manages to avoid taking sides. This he does by combining

¹ Pope, *Iliad*, VIII. 65; cf. Homer, *Iliad*, VIII. 51 f.:

αὐτὸς δ' ἐν κορυφῇσι καθέζετο κύβεϊ γαίαν
εἰσορῶν Τρώων τε πόλιν καὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν.

² *The Battel of the Poets* (1729):

When was I known basely to court the Schools,
And not to rail at dull methodic Fools,
Who dare not venture from their Depth to wade? . . .
A Genius form'd like mine will soar at all,
And boldly follow where subscriptions call.
My gentle Touch from *Homer* clear'd the Rust,
And from the Brow of *Shakespeare* wip'd the Dust.

in his rendering the sense of as many interpretations as he can.¹ One could hardly call it an heroic method, but Pope uses it quite openly and with considerable skill. It is therefore somewhat disconcerting when the 'history' of a passage shows him not only making a stand of his own, but a stand on ground which is decidedly unfirm. The occasion is the famous speech of Agamemnon dissuading his brother from taking up Hector's challenge:²

τούτω δὲ πρόβμον ἄλλον ἀναστήσουσιν Ἀχαιοί.
εἴ περ ἀδελῆς τ' ἐστὶ καὶ εἰ μόθου ἔστ' ἀκόρητος,
φημί μιν ἀσπασίως γόνυ κάμψειν, αἶ κε φύγησι
δῆϊον ἐκ πολέμοιο καὶ αἰνῆς δῆϊότητος.

In the edition Pope renders this:³

The mightiest Warrior of th' Achaian Name,
Tho' bold, and burning with Desire for Fame;
Content, the doubtful Honour might foregoe,
So great the Danger, and so brave the Foe . . .

on which Gilbert Wakefield (whose attitude to Pope's *Iliad* sometimes reminds one of Bentley's to *Paradise Lost*) comments:

Our poet here is enveloped in a cloud of darkness raised by himself. He has totally mistaken a passage, which is perfectly plain to any man, who has but a moderate knowledge of the original: nor has any one of his predecessors in English translation represented the sense amiss.⁴

There is some truth in this: Chapman, Hobbes, and Ogilby all make these lines refer to Hector and not to the Greek champion—though Hobbes represents the sense amiss in other respects. On the other hand, Joshua Barnes in his Latin gloss,⁵ and Mme Dacier, whom Pope seems to have followed, are decidedly ambiguous:

Les Grecs auront soin de choisir un autre adversaire à *Hector*, et quelque intrepide et quelque infatigable qu'il puisse estre dans les combats, je vous responds que s'il peut échapper au danger où il s'expose, il se reposera volontiers de ses grands travaux.⁶

Pope, in fact, hardly deserves such massive censure: grammatically his version is possible, and in a note on the passage he makes both his

¹ See, for instance, the opening lines of Book I (1st edn.) and Pope's Observation ad loc.

² Homer, *Iliad*, VII. 116 ff.

³ Pope, *Iliad*, VII. 134 ff.

⁴ *Homer's Iliad translated by Alexander Pope . . . with additional notes . . . By Gilbert Wakefield* (1796), Book VII, note ad loc.

⁵ ΟΜΗΡΟΥ ΙΛΙΑΣ κ.τ.λ. (ed. Joshua Barnes, 1711), Book VII, gloss ad loc.: 'Licet intrepidusque sit & etiamsi pugnae sit insatiabilis, Existimo eum libenter genu flexurum; si effugerit Ardenti ex bello & gravi pugna.'

⁶ *L'Iliade d'Homere traduite en François, . . . par Madame Dacier* (1711), vol. II, p. 96.

This rather startling change of front must have come about, I think, as a result of information supplied by Broome before the copy went to press. The repercussions are to be seen in the unrevised version of the proofs, where he deserts Hobbes for Barnes and Dacier:

Greece in our Cause shall arm some pow'rful Hand.
 Bold as he is, insatiate of the Fight,
 He tempts a Danger that may match his Might.
 What Chief soe'er from hence in Safety goes
 Shall bless the welcome Hour that brings Repose.

By this time he has dropped the idea of 'stooping in prayer', but he is still uncertain what to do with the phrase αἵ κε φύγησι, and so falls back on the ambiguous Latin gloss *si effugerit*. That he was uncertain to the last may be inferred from the fact that in the proofs his final version is written between the printed lines, but the latter have not been cancelled. Poor Pope, was he hoping for yet another chance to revise?

In the end, however, he comes out boldly in favour of the interpretation that the doubtful words 'signify not to escape out of the Combat (as the Translators take it) but to avoid entering into it'.¹ In doing this Pope is being faithful to Homer according to his lights. For him Homer's supreme characteristic is that he does nothing 'from want of Choice but from an Insight into Nature'.² Where Pope is faced with conflicting interpretations (as he supposes) the one which seems to illustrate this insight best is the one he prefers.³ It may not be altogether the method of a scholar; but equally it does not convict Pope of being either a charlatan or an ignoramus.

In quoting from the Arsenal volume I have used mainly passages which have undergone extensive revision because this seemed the most compendious way of illustrating the material available. Briefer revisions are often no less interesting, and, of course, far more numerous. In fact, if these proofs did nothing more than confirm our impression of the immense labour that went into Pope's *Iliad* they would be valuable. They do more than this, however, for they illustrate Pope's methods, both as a poet and as a translator, and perhaps, as I have suggested, throw some light on historical problems hitherto obscure.

¹ Pope, *Iliad*, vii, Obs. xv.

² Ibid. i, Obs. liii.

³ A brief example from the proofs may make this clearer. In the description of Paris' house (vi. 393) he renders the Homeric καλὰ as 'stately', with a cancelled variant 'glittering'. In the proof 'stately' is emended to 'pompous' because he wishes to depreciate Paris' character.

RUGBY 1850: ARNOLD, CLOUGH, WALROND, AND IN MEMORIAM

By KATHLEEN TILLOTSON

I

AN eyewitness account of Matthew Arnold as a young master at Rugby from the recollections of one who was then a schoolboy; a visit from Clough with the newly published *In Memoriam* under his arm, and Arnold's comments thereon: this might be expected to figure in bibliographical and critical studies of one or more of the three poets. That it does not¹ may argue that it has been overlooked or forgotten; or possibly that it has been considered and discarded as manifestly fictitious. In either case it is worth while to look at the context and the inherent probability of the account, its corroboration from other sources and the qualifications of the witness.

Arnold and Clough appear, under their own names, in *The Three Friends: a Story of Rugby in the Forties* (Oxford University Press, 1900). The author was the Rev. Arthur Gray Butler, then almost seventy years old. He had been a boy at Rugby from 1844 to 1850, under A. C. Tait, who succeeded Dr. Arnold; half a century after, when he was Fellow and Tutor at Oriel, he published his one prose work,² this unpretentious and charming school-story. 'Hovering between fact and fiction', he says in the Preface, it is designed 'to give a picture of the Rugby I knew and loved, at a time subsequent to that described so inimitably in *Tom Brown*'. It is a pleasant if desultory tale, a prose idyll rather than a novel; its substance is the events of three school-years, especially as affecting two friends, Gordon and Fleming.³ Clearest among the background figures of the staff are the headmaster, Tait, and a young tutor called Fulton. There is no reference to Arnold until the ninth chapter, 'By-play', last but one in the book.

¹ There is an incidental reference, with a brief quotation, in Alan Harris, 'Matthew Arnold: the unknown years', *Nineteenth Century*, cxiii (April 1933), 502. Sydney Selfe, *Chapters in the History of Rugby School* (Rugby, 1910), pp. 78-79, also quotes one sentence and identifies 'Fulton'.

² His other publications are two historical dramas (*Charles I*, 1874, revised 1907, and *Harold*, 1892, revised 1906), a volume of poems, *The Choice of Achilles*, 1900, and reminiscences contributed to various biographies (see below, p. 133 n. 6).

³ The third friend appears to be 'Twining', but he is more shadowy, and has left by ch. viii; the wild 'O'Brien' is perhaps a better candidate. I have not attempted to identify the boys; some of Butler's own experiences, and probably his characteristics, are represented in both Gordon and Fleming, but neither can be a self-portrait. The dedication 'to George Joachim Goschen, our leader at school' (he was head boy in 1850) may suggest another possible model. There are half a dozen references to Butler in A. D. Elliot's *Life of Goschen* (1911), but no reference to the book.

(Gordon and Fleming are now in their third and last year in the sixth form and discussing their futures.)

'How would you like to be a Master here?' Gordon asked.

'Not clever enough!' said Fleming. 'I could never do that First Class work at Oxford.'

'Oh, couldn't you? You could do anything if you tried; and you'd be up to all the fellows' tricks; and they'd do twice as much for you as for some of the men here.'

'Did you hear of Mat Arnold the other day,' asked Fleming, 'when they brought in news that it was a half-holiday? "Thank Heaven!" he said aloud, and the Form cheered him.'

'He's not the stuff to make a Master of,' said Gordon, grimly. 'Fancy him teaching little chaps *τύπτω* and the verbs in *μι*! How could he? There's not a bit of the Dominic about him. He's much too great a swell.'

'Oh, he'd do it fast enough if he had to do it,' said Fleming. . . . Gordon shook his head.

'He'd never be a Fulton,' he said

'No,' said Fleming, 'of course there's no one like Fulton as a Master. But Arnold, if he got something he liked, might make you feel—well, something that Fulton couldn't. And he's *ΑΙ* at Fives.'

The boys go to visit Fulton, 'to eat strawberries', and find him and Arnold talking on the lawn. Arnold is 'lolling back in an easy chair', watching the clouds, 'as he indolently stroked the head of a great stag-hound'; the two are engaged in a discussion on the subject of marks, which Fulton supports as a necessary incentive in the Lower School.

'Ah, my friend Fleming,' said Arnold, turning to the new arrivals, 'you are just in time to mediate between me and Mr. Fulton' (the Mister was uttered somewhat unwillingly); 'he says that these little creatures, whom I have the honour of teaching, by a whim of our good Tait, must be treated like young pigs, poked at and prodded everlastingly, till they are taught to squeak intelligibly. What do you say? As one who knows something of these barbarians' (this was said playfully), 'do you believe in the prodding system?'

The debate is clearly intended to have a wider application: Arnold believes that 'to teach the world one should give wings to the few', Fulton that 'it is the many we have to do most for'. But Arnold mockingly turns the question aside:

'They gather round me after lesson to know what marks I give them—it's the only thing they care for—with an eagerness, a ferocity, which is quite appalling. . . . These strawberries are delicious. I observe, by the by, you take the smallest ones. I understand. Quite professional! Are they the sweetest?'

¹ This and the following passages quoted are from ch. ix, pp. 100-5.

'No! But someone—was it you, Arnold?—had already taken the biggest. Pray don't say anything. I understand. Quite instinctive! You always loved distinction.'

Arnold picks out one strawberry for admiration—

'an imperial one, quite the grand style. Ripe too all over! I wonder how much of me would ever come to ripeness if I was a School-Master?'

But this mild fooling, slightly reminiscent of a well-known scene in *The Importance of Being Earnest*, is dissipated by the unexpected appearance of a visitor,

strongly-built, with a grave, thoughtful look, and expressive eyes that lighted up a somewhat sombre countenance.

'Clough!' shouted the Tutor.

The ensuing passage deserves quoting in its entirety; and with it and its context before us it may be possible to see what proportion of truth of fact or of impression it can contain.

'In the name of the Prophet, Clough!' said Arnold, 'fresh from Oxford damps and metaphysics to breathe real youth and freshness at Rugby! Well! They have not killed me yet, dear, as you said they would: not even their whole school-days and First lessons! Dear creatures! They are very kind to me, on the whole, though they made me an April fool one day. But a plague on pedagogy, when you are here! What is that under your arm?'

'A new book of poems, Mat,' said Clough, simply, 'just out. It marks an era.' 'Yours,' said Arnold inquiringly, 'yours, beloved?'

'No! something far higher! Something for the highest heaven! It is one of the Immortals.' And he handed him, as he sat down, a little brown volume, from which Arnold read eagerly, '*In Memoriam, A.H.H.* No author! Who is A.H.H.?' 'They say it is Arthur Hallam,' replied the other, 'and the author shines out in every line. It must be Tennyson. Read No. 56!'

And then turning to the Tutor and the two boys, after a few words about Oxford, he fell easily into Rugby talk. He was not a great talker himself, but he loved to hear others talk, and was a sympathetic listener. The boys, especially, interested him; and, as their awe of the great man faded, they chattered away freely, delighted to find that he knew the country even better than themselves. . . .

Meanwhile Arnold was heard murmuring to himself, 'Beautiful! Luminous! A new metre! A masterpiece! It must be Alfred.' Then at last turning to Clough, and handing him the book, he said, with faltering voice, all the light playfulness, with which he cloaked real earnestness, departed, 'Read! My voice is wasted in much teaching.' And pointing with his finger, 'There!' And Clough read, in a soft low voice, like far-off music:

[The first and last two verses of No. lvi, 'Peace, come away', are then quoted.]

'Another,' said Arnold, lying back, and playing with the great staghound's ears, 'another!' And again Clough read, not as picking out favourites, but letting eyes and fingers choose for him, one after another of those immortal poems,

which took the heart of England by storm, and have been the delight and strength of the English-speaking race ever since.

And as often as he stopped, Arnold would say, almost in a whisper, 'Another!' till at last, closing the book, Clough said, 'It must be Tennyson. Who else could it be? And his greatest work!—Did you know Hallam, Mat?'

Then Arnold murmured something about 'Immortal' and recovering himself with a sigh, replied, 'Hallam? Oh, yes, I saw him once. He was unlike other men. But it needed friendship to understand it. Ah, Clough, when we have that villa in the Caucasus we used to talk of—'

'The Caucasus,' said the young Tutor, starting up. 'Bless me! Why, here we are forgetting Third lesson. Come along!' Arnold groaned, and they all laughed.

The question of marks is revived by the entrance of Fulton's sister bringing him his mark-list. Arnold teases her; he would have guessed who would be top and who would be bottom ('about a dozen of them'); so why not have saved the 'bother' of adding up marks? And with a final flourish, he is gone:

'Amid the general decay of virtue at the present moment, let us not forget punctuality, and Third lesson! Good afternoon!' The boys went off, avowing Clough and Arnold were both splendid fellows and *In Memoriam* was the finest poem in the world . . . and the School bookseller had much to do to supply the demand for it.

The only further reference to Arnold is in the final chapter:

Fulton . . . wrote to Arnold, who had left Rugby suddenly, vowing that his villa in the Caucasus was not to be purchased there.

II

The scene quoted purports to have taken place at Rugby in June 1850; the month is specified, strawberries are being eaten, the Rugby term ended in the second half of June, and *In Memoriam* was published on June 1. Can the actors—Arnold, Clough, 'Fulton', and (presumably) A. G. Butler himself—have been together at that time and place? I shall show that they can, if not in those precise roles. 'Fulton' is identified by Selfe (on the high authority of 'the Dean of Wells'¹) with Theodore Walrond; he was a master at Rugby from 1848 to 1851,² and had a boarding-house at 12 and 14 Hillmorton Road.³ He and Arnold were old friends, but, so far as we

¹ T. W. Jex-Blake, 1832–1915; Butler's contemporary at Rugby (1844–51), at University College, Oxford, and again as master at Rugby (1858–68). He was headmaster from 1874 to 1885. He wrote Butler's obituary notice in the school magazine, *The Meteor*, 3 February 1909.

² The *Rugby School Register* gives the date as 1853, but other evidence makes it clear that Walrond was tutor at Balliol from 1851 to 1856. The *Register's* date might be accounted for by a temporary return for a brief period in 1853.

³ *Rugby School Register*, 1902, ii, p. xv; cf. *Three Friends*, p. 56.

know, never actually fellow masters; Arnold's Rugby teaching was probably confined to a few months between December 1844 and March 1845, and by 1850 he was in the third and last year of his employment as Lord Lansdowne's secretary.¹ That he had often visited Rugby since his father's death we know from his letters to Clough and from other sources;² he was on excellent terms with Tait, his old Balliol tutor, and wrote to him in 1842 heartily approving his appointment.³ He was certainly at Rugby in November 1849, concerned in the election of Tait's successor, Goulburn, and discussing it with the masters. Most of them were old friends, and some were his own Rugby and Oxford contemporaries, recently appointed; besides Theodore Walrond there were 'Plug' Arnold, G. G. Bradley, and J. C. Shairp. The letters of both Clough and Arnold show that Rugby under Tait was not only their old school but a sort of colony of Oxford (and especially Balliol) where contemporaries would meet freely and frequently to discuss the affairs of school, university, and world. When a master was ill, some old Rugbeian who was a recent graduate would be called in to take over the absentee's teaching for a week or two, and it is even possible that Arnold was doing this in June 1850. There is certainly nothing either in Arnold's known habits or in the few records of his movements for the summer of 1850 to prevent us from assuming that he was at Rugby for a short visit in June.⁴

Clough, too, was a frequent visitor to Rugby, and was certainly there in October 1850,⁵ on his return from Venice (when Arnold just missed him), and perhaps also in June; the tone of a letter to Shairp from London on

¹ The obituary notice in *The Times* (17 April 1888) refers only to a period of teaching after leaving Lord Lansdowne and before the Inspectorship, but this notice contains other demonstrable inaccuracies.

² The records of the Debating Society from 1845 show him as 'a frequent visitor' (W. H. D. Rouse, *A History of Rugby School* (1898), pp. 289-90. It is possible that these records survive, but I have not been able to consult them). It was not until about 1848 that Arnold's last brother left the school.

³ W. Benham and R. Davidson, *Life of Archbishop Tait* (1891), p. 115. Clough had written to the trustees in support of Tait's candidature (Selfe, pp. 68-69).

⁴ The demands of his secretaryship would probably not allow a long one. Parliament was in session from 9 April to 16 August, save for the Whitsun recess, which fell in May. There is evidence (in *The Times* reports) of Lord Lansdowne's presence in London on 7, 22, 26, and 28 June, and his absence at Bowood is not noted until 6-8 July. Of direct evidence of Arnold's doings this summer there is very little, with a gap in the published correspondence from May to October. In May his mother and sister Jane were visiting him in London, and on 15 August he was at Rydal, for Jane's (postponed) marriage with W. E. Forster (Mrs. Humphry Ward, *A Writer's Recollections* (1918), pp. 35, 46; *The Times*, 19 August 1850) and left almost at once. The manuscript of 'Calais Sands' is dated 'August 1850', and Arnold's preoccupations in the late summer may be inferred from this poem and the related 'Faded Leaves'. See also Clough's letter to Tom Arnold, quoted in *Commentary*, p. 170.

⁵ *Letters of Matthew Arnold to Arthur Hugh Clough*, ed. H. F. Lowry (1932), p. 116 (cited below as L.C.).

19 June¹ possibly suggests a recent meeting. (He did not leave England until after 23 July, when the session at University Hall was over.) We are therefore free to suppose Arnold and Clough at Rugby in mid-June, even if it is untrue that Arnold was teaching and that Clough was 'fresh from Oxford damps and metaphysics'. And the natural objective for them both would be the house of their old friend Theodore Walrond in Hillmorton Road.²

That Walrond was an intimate friend of both poets at this time, there is plenty of scattered evidence in the letters and elsewhere.³ The friendship evidently dated from schooldays. Theodore Walrond entered the School House at Rugby in 1834, three years before Clough left for Balliol; he and Arnold were sixth-formers together, and he was captain of the school at the time of Dr. Arnold's death. He followed Arnold to Balliol as a scholar in 1842, taking a first class in 1845.⁴ He was thus an exact contemporary at school and university of Matthew's next brother, Thomas, who recalled their friendship half a century later in these words:⁵

After I came up to the University in October [1842], Clough, Theodore Walrond, my brother and I formed a little interior company, and saw a great deal of one another. We used often to go skiffing up the Cherwell, or else in the network of river channels that meander through the broad meadows facing Ifley and Sandford. After a time it was arranged that we four should always breakfast in Clough's rooms on Sunday morning. These were times of great enjoyment.

At a much briefer distance of time, Matthew Arnold, writing to his brother in Tasmania in 1857, also recalled it:

You alone of my brothers are associated with that life at Oxford, the *freest* and most delightful part, perhaps, of my life, when with you and Clough and Walrond I shook off all the bonds and formalities of the place, and enjoyed the spring of life, and that unforgotten Oxfordshire and Berkshire country. . . . 'The Scholar Gipsy' . . . was meant to fix the remembrance of those delightful wanderings of ours in the Cumner hills before they were quite effaced—and as such, Clough and Walrond accepted it.⁶

¹ *Poems and Prose Remains* (1869), i. 168 (cited below as *P. and P.R.*). The letter of January 1850 (p. 113) also shows his close contact with Rugby masters.

² Probably the house where Arnold lodged when teaching at Rugby in 1844-5. It was then the Rev. Algernon Grenfell's 'house', and Arnold took Grenfell's place during his last illness. Grenfell died on 6 March 1845; Richard Congreve was appointed in April and succeeded to the same house. (*Rugby School Register* (1901), i, x, xix, xxii; and cf. *L.C.*, p. 56.)

³ See below. No biographical notice of Walrond exists apart from a brief obituary in *The Times* of 20 June 1887 and a longer one in the *Annual Register*.

⁴ *Rugby School Register* (1901), i. 274, and *The Times*, 20 June 1887.

⁵ 'Arthur Hugh Clough: a Sketch', *Nineteenth Century*, xlii (January 1898), 106-7. Cf. W. Y. Sellar's letter to W. Knight, in *Some Nineteenth Century Scotsmen* (1903), p. 264: 'When I was an undergraduate, A. H. Clough, the two Arnolds, Walrond, and Shairp, formed a kind of quinque-lateral.'

⁶ Ward, p. 54. Others recalled the 'Decade', the select debating society of which the

In 1843 Walrond and Clough were on holiday abroad together,¹ and in 1844 all three were together in Patterdale, on a reading-party (Walrond reading, and Arnold fishing).² At this point the Butler family enters the picture: George Butler, an elder brother, had a reading-party at Grasmere,³ and joined Walrond's party on Helvellyn:

when we got into a mist, and through the mist, near the top, loomed out Walrond and Clough and Matthew Arnold. . . .⁴

In March 1845 Arnold at Rugby wrote to Clough at Oxford, with 'my love to Walrond';⁵ in the late summer Clough visited Walrond at his home at Calder Park near Glasgow, after a Highland expedition, in which Thomas and Edward Arnold had also shared;⁶ and in 1847 Walrond and Thomas Arnold visited Clough on that famous reading-party at Drumadocet⁷ on which some incidents in *The Bothie* were founded, Walrond perhaps figuring in the poem as 'Arthur, the glory of headers'.⁸ In November 1847 Walrond, Clough, and Matthew Arnold dined at Balliol and attended a meeting of the 'Decade'.⁹ In July 1848 Arnold (without permission) confided to Walrond Clough's intention 'to resign his fellowship';¹⁰ in August Walrond became a master at Rugby,¹¹ and Clough evidently visited him there in November, as Arnold wrote to Clough crowing over them both for their misjudgement of Edward Arnold's prospects in the Schools.¹² Clough's letters of 1849 imply a continued correspondence with Walrond, and Walrond and Shairp were the only two besides Arnold to whom he showed the manuscript of *Amours de Voyage*.¹³

In November 1849 Arnold was at Rugby, walking to Thurleston and Kenilworth with Walrond ('don't you envy me', he writes to Clough),¹⁴ and again in October 1850, just missing Clough on the latter's visit after his

three were members; e.g. Lord Coleridge, in W. Knight, *Principal Shairp and his Friends* (1888), pp. 411-12.

¹ *P. and P.R.* i. 90.

² *Ibid.* i. 93.

³ This is described by Josephine E. Butler, *Recollections of George Butler* (n.d.), p. 37, and (much more fully) in an article by George Butler in *Longman's Magazine* (October 1888, xii. 621-35).

⁴ J. E. Butler, p. 48; recollections of Spencer Perceval Butler, a younger brother who was a member of the reading-party, and at Rugby 1841-7. George Butler was at Harrow, and at Exeter College; he would know Arnold and Clough as fellow members of the 'Decade'.

⁵ *L.C.*, p. 55.

⁶ Knight, *op. cit.*, pp. 87-88; and cf. *P. and P.R.* i. 97 ff., and Thomas Arnold's article cited above.

⁷ Knight, pp. 103 ff., with reminiscences written by Thomas Arnold, and Edward and George Scott, as well as Shairp's (previously printed in *P. and P.R.* i. 28-30).

⁸ Knight, p. 110 (letter from Edward Scott).

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 115.

¹⁰ *L.C.*, p. 87.

¹¹ *Rugby School Register* (1901), i. xvi.

¹² *L.C.*, pp. 94-95; the editor misinterprets this letter.

¹³ *P. and P.R.* i. 116, 165.

¹⁴ *L.C.*, p. 113; and cf. *Letters*, ed. G. W. E. Russell (1895), i. 11.

return from Venice, about which Clough had evidently been uncommunicative ('Walrond seems to have learnt nothing of your late goings on').¹ The 'little interior company' of undergraduate days, already reduced by Thomas Arnold's emigration in 1847, was by now beginning to disperse. But Walrond, like Clough, was at Arnold's wedding in June 1851;² he stood godfather to his second son in 1853;³ and when Arnold wrote to Clough in New England about his 1852 poems, he still implied the three-fold cord.⁴

I doubt whether I shall ever have heat and radiance enough to pierce the clouds that are massed around me. Not in my little social sphere, indeed, with you and Walrond; there I could crackle to my grave—but vis à vis of the world.

(That 'crackling' in a 'little social sphere', with both 'heat and radiance', is just what Arthur Butler shows in *The Three Friends*.) In the autumn of 1854 Arnold and Walrond once more explored the Cumnor country together.⁵ The 'great town's harsh heart-wearying roar' asserted its claims; but the friendship ended only with their lives. When Walrond died in 1887, Arnold 'felt as if part of his life had been taken from him'.⁶

Sellar was once saying to Mathew Arnold how good Theodore Walrond was, and Arnold replied, 'Ah, we were all good at Rugby!' 'Yes,' said [Sellar], 'but he has remained good!'⁷

The 'goodness' of Walrond was valued by all who knew him. Max Müller used to call him his 'English conscience', and Lord Bowen acclaimed him as 'the modern Hercules, whose choice was always the choice of virtue'.⁸ It is a virtue that shines through the portrait of 'Fulton'; and the intimacy pictured in Butler's story, with its quick modulation from banter to earnestness, corresponds with, even if it does not literally exemplify, an amply attested reality. Butler has written of 'three friends' in more than his ostensible sense.

That Butler himself had come to know Walrond well when at Rugby is suggested by the chance records⁹ of a boating-party at Oxford in 1851, with

¹ *L.C.*, p. 116.

² Harris, p. 509.

³ *Letters*, i. 48.

⁴ *L.C.*, p. 126; and cf. p. 129.

⁵ *Letters*, i. 38; by this time Walrond was back at Oxford, where he held a Balliol Fellowship from 1850 to 1857, acting as tutor from 1851 to 1856, when he was appointed Civil Service Examiner. Later letters show that he telegraphed to Arnold reports of the progress of the election to the Professorship of Poetry in 1857 (Ward, p. 55), and spent a long holiday abroad with him in 1858. Walrond married Charlotte Grenfell in 1859 and became Secretary to the Civil Service Commissioners in 1863. He wrote Dr. Arnold's life for the *D.N.B.* in 1885 and began to prepare a full biography of Arthur Stanley.

⁶ *Recollections of G. D. Boyle* (1895), p. 182.

⁷ E. M. Sellar, *Recollections and Impressions* (1907), pp. 327-8.

⁸ H. S. Cunningham, *Lord Bowen* (1893), p. 140 (at a speech at Balliol in 1877).

⁹ E. Graham, *The Harrow Life of Henry Montagu Butler* (1920), p. 60; Josephine E. Butler, *Recollections of George Butler* (n.d.), p. 87.

his younger brother, Goschen, and Walrond, and a picnic party to 'Witchwood' with his older brother, Goschen, and again Walrond. Butler's own history was repeating the pattern laid down by his young elders: scholarship, first class, Oriel fellowship, return to Rugby as assistant master.¹ There was even a reading-party at Grasmere in 1853² to echo that of 1844; while Butler and Goschen founded an 'Essay Society'³ to take the place of the expiring 'Decade', to which his elder brother had been proud to be elected in 1841.⁴ Arthur Butler's brothers indeed complete the chain. By 1844 he would know their contemporaries by repute. When he himself entered the School House at Rugby in August at the age of twelve, he would join the 'huge form'⁵ to which Matthew Arnold, waiting for something to turn up after his inglorious second class, came to 'teach small boys *τίπτω*' at £100 a term. There, perhaps, he heard him 'thank heaven' when a half-holiday was announced; and may have guessed, as boys will, how Arnold was likely to spend it.⁶

But the ninth chapter of *The Three Friends* claims to be the fruit of maturer observation. In June 1850 Arthur Butler was a sixth-form boy, in his last term, perhaps his last week, at school; and what he then saw would be the more clearly photographed on his always retentive mind⁷ by the sentiment of valediction. He was going up to University College, Oxford;⁸ Clough, Arnold, and Walrond represented his own future.

The hypothesis that Butler himself knew Arnold and perhaps Clough (and the former not merely as one of a 'huge form' of over sixty) has some independent evidence; in 1909 those who recollected Arthur Butler were able to say that at Rugby he 'laid the foundations of lifelong friendship with members of the Rugby circle, including, of older men, Dean Stanley and Matthew Arnold',⁹ and that 'it was a revelation to have a tutor who had

¹ Butler taught at Rugby from 1858 to 1862, along with his old schoolfellows T. W. Jex-Blake, Edward Scott, and Philip Bowden-Smith.

² *Recollections of John Henry Bridges* (1908), p. 62 (from Butler's contributions), and G. C. Brodrick, *Memories and Impressions* (1900), p. 88.

³ Brodrick, p. 100; *Charles Henry Pearson* (1900), p. 72; *Life of Goschen*, ii. i. 24.

⁴ *Recollections of George Butler*, p. 31.

⁵ *L.C.*, p. 56, letter of March 1845. If Butler had three years in the Sixth, like 'Gordon' and 'Fleming', this seems very likely. C. H. Pearson, at Rugby 1843-6, started in the Lower Fifth at the age of twelve, 'a class of more than sixty', and recalls the masters as being 'over-taxed by the great size of their divisions, numbering from 40 to 70' (*Memorials*, 1900, p. 13).

⁶ In sending a message by Clough to Richard Congreve, the Rugby-Oxonian who was to succeed him, Arnold commands the 'stabling' as well as the apricot marmalade.

⁷ See below, p. 133, n. 6.

⁸ He had matriculated in March, but the *Life of Tait* shows that he was still at school when the headmaster departed in May. He was obviously mistaken when he said in his contribution to the *Life of Stanley* (i. 358) that he entered University College in 1849.

⁹ *The Times*, 18 January 1909, p. 13; and *The Haileyburian*, 19 February 1909, p. 169.

known in the flesh our literary heroes, Clough and Matthew Arnold, and loved to talk of them'.¹ It is true that the evidence for any 'life-long friendship' with Arnold is wanting,² as not with Stanley.³ But my conviction that the ninth chapter is fact rather than fiction has other sources.

III

It proclaims its essential authenticity as a portrait of Arnold in the very turn of his speech; there is a *panache* at once recognizable to those familiar with the letters to Clough and personal anecdotes of the young Arnold. This is something that could not be faked, could not be concocted out of remote childish memories and a maturer knowledge of Arnold's published writings or even a maturer acquaintance with the man. The Arnold of the 'unknown years' is now partly known to us, but was hardly known to mere readers of Arnold in 1900. (About that time the recently published letters were criticized by their nominal editor for their 'obscurance' of Arnold's 'over-flowing gaiety'.)⁴ But the Arnold his Oxford friends knew, with affectation and banter masking earnestness and melancholy ('I laugh too much and they make one's laughter mean too much');⁵ the exuberance and nonchalance, the gay speculative intellect, the 'Olympian manners', the flourishes of affection,⁶ are all caught in Arthur Butler's picture of that June afternoon in Hillmorton Road. Suspended between the claims of a villa in the Caucasus and of Third Lesson, eating strawberries in 'the grand style',⁷ and discoursing semi-allegorically on end-of-term marks ('the best . . . is what we want'), 'much too great a swell to be a Dominic'—this is recognizably the Matthew Arnold of the early poems, the few 1845 letters ('For me, I am a reed, a very whoreson Bullrush; yet such as I am, I give satisfaction'),⁸ the Arnold observed in 1850 by Charlotte Brontë ('seeming foppery', but with a 'real modesty' and 'intellectual aspirations'

¹ *The Haileyburian*, p. 178 (letter from an Oriel pupil).

² Henry Montagu Butler knew Arnold well in the sixties, when he was living at Harrow and had two boys in the school, and the note of a visit to 'old Mrs. Butler' (the mother) in 1871 (*Letters*, ii. 58) suggests a family friendship.

³ See below, p. 133 n. 6.

⁴ G. W. E. Russell, *Matthew Arnold* (1904), p. viii; the letters had been 'severely edited' before they came into his hands, and were further censored in proof. And see Saintsbury's complaint of the complete obscurity of Arnold's early years (*Matthew Arnold*, 1909).

⁵ *Life and Correspondence of Lord Coleridge* (1904), i. 145 (letter of 1844); and cf. Thomas Arnold—'His keen bantering talk made him something of a social lion among Oxford men' (*Passages in a Wandering Life*, 1900, p. 56), and Max Müller, *Auld Lang Syne* (1898), pp. 111–12, and *My Autobiography* (1901), pp. 272–3.

⁶ The 'dear' and 'beloved' reported here match the frequent address of 'my love' to Clough, which the American editor imperceptively called a 'somewhat curious expression' (*L.C.*, p. 59). But Margaret Woods, George Bradley's daughter, had already testified that 'it was thus he used to address his friends' (*Essays and Studies*, xv (1929), 8).

⁷ Arnold was already using the phrase privately in 1850; *L.C.*, p. 115.

⁸ *L.C.*, p. 56.

under 'assumed conceit' and 'superficial affectation'),¹ and by Crabb Robinson:

a very gentlemanly young man with a light tinge of the fop which does no harm when blended with talents, good nature, and high spirits;²

even the Arnold who defeated George Bradley's attempt to impress visiting parents by refusing food in these startling terms:

'No thank you, my darling, I've just bitten off the tails of those three bull-pups of yours.'³

Butler's presentation of Clough is comparatively the merest outline, and would not by itself carry any evidence of authenticity; it is true to what is well known of Clough's appearance and quiet manner, but could easily have been gathered from hearsay or a reading of the memoir of 1869. But there is one minor figure in the scene who is worth pausing over for a moment: the 'great staghound' whose head Arnold is 'indolently' stroking. This is surely Gruim, the 'Scotch staghound of great power and beauty',⁴ the constant companion of another master and Balliol friend of Arnold, Clough, and Walrond—J. C. Shairp. The picturesqueness of the school scene and its scope for harmless flamboyance is again suggested by what we read of Shairp in his friends' and pupils' reminiscences:

All old Rugbians of the time will remember the impression he at once created, as he stalked about, sometimes with a plaid around him, and a long crook in his hand, and a noble deerhound at his side. . . .⁵

The particular old Rugbeian who wrote those words was Arthur Butler. And one of Bradley's reminiscences adds another important link, for it shows Shairp walking right through a cricket game absorbed in a newly published book—*In Memoriam*.⁶ Another biography containing reminiscences by Arthur Butler shows how firmly other parts of *The Three Friends* are compounded out of fact. The recollections of Tait as headmaster and incidents of his reign, in his first volume of *The Life of Archbishop Tait*, to which Butler contributed, nowhere contradict and in many respects tally closely with the material of *The Three Friends*.⁷ A detailed comparison

¹ Letter to James Taylor, 15 January 1851 (*The Brontës* (Oxford, 1932), iii. 199).

² *Correspondence with the Wordsworth Circle*, ed. Edith Morley (1927), ii. 743.

³ Margaret Woods; cf. p. 131, n. 6 above. From her reference to G. G. Bradley's age, the date was probably 1848, and the incident is further evidence of the frequency of Arnold's casual visits to the school.

⁴ Knight, p. 131; contributed by Archbishop Tait.

⁵ Knight, p. 134; Gruim's name is on p. 136, and his existence is mentioned also by Hodgson (Knight, p. 154).

⁶ Knight, pp. 139–40; contributed by Bradley.
⁷ Ch. vi, and cf. Butler, Bradley, and others in *Life of Tait*. The trouble with the Sixth, Tait's illness, the scenes at his departure, and minute details of the 'mutiny' of 1848 appear in both biography and story.

confirms the impression that a large part of the novel is intended as history, though individual characteristics may be blended and periods telescoped.¹ Something of Shairp's well-known friendliness with the boys² may be glanced at, along with the deerhound, in 'Fulton'; he was at the time almost equally intimate with Arnold and Clough. Something also, perhaps, of Butler himself when he returned as a master in 1858,³ for example, in Fulton's balancing of the claims of athletic and academic distinction:

And then the Tutor smiled, and thought of his own achievements in old days, in both fields of prowess; and as a cup won at Henley met his eye, he said to himself, 'After all, which did give me the greatest pleasure, that or the Balliol? It was a near thing between them.'⁴

For Butler himself was remembered at Rugby for athletic prowess in cricket, fives, and football,⁵ and for giving his name to 'Butler's Leap', as well as for his scholarship at University College, his Ireland and double First.

Arthur Butler's credit as a witness is high. He knew Rugby well, as boy and later as master; as undergraduate at University College (for one year under Arthur Stanley, who became a lifelong friend), as Headmaster of Haileybury and as Fellow and Tutor of Oriel, he had the ideal atmosphere for preserving and rehearsing his recollections; the reminiscences contributed to the biographies of Tait, Shairp, and others⁶ show the piety and felicity, and the picturesque choice of detail, with which he could present them; and where they can be checked, the excellence of his memory. Both at Haileybury and Oxford he was remembered as one who had known great men in their early days, and delighted to talk of them. A Rugbeian reviewer of *The Three Friends* approved the portraits of Arnold and Clough as drawn from the life. Much of the tale, including all that concerns Tait as headmaster and the 'mutiny' of 1848, can easily be shown to be authentic.

¹ 'The story . . . opens with an incident of the game for which we can vouch, though the date, we think, is an anachronism. . . . He certainly leaves an impression of more intimacy between masters and boys than we ever remember as existing' (Review in *Athenaeum*, 12 Jan. 1901, p. 50). 'Fulton' was 'fresh from Oxford' in 1847 (ch. iv), a year before Walrond's appointment.

² Knight, ch. viii; see especially reminiscences contributed by Davey and Hodgson. Shairp was (in 1846) another of Tait's Balliol appointments, and one applauded by Arnold (Knight, p. 137).

³ *The Meteor*, 3 February, pp. 6-7; obituary notice by T. W. Jex-Blake, and letter from 'A. S.'

⁴ *The Three Friends*, p. 51.

⁵ *The Meteor*, 3 February, pp. 6-7.

⁶ R. E. Prothero and G. G. Bradley, *Life and Correspondence of Arthur Penrhyn Stanley*, 2 vols. (1893), i. 358-9, 428, ii. 12; *Charles Henry Pearson, Memorials*, ed. W. Stebbing (1900), pp. 144-50; *Recollections of J. H. Bridges* (1908), pp. 60-67; *Frederick Temple: a Memoir*, ed. E. G. Sandford. (2 vols. 1906), pp. 172-5, 214-19. The liveliest records of Stanley as an Oxford tutor in 1850-1 came from Butler; and the words 'Even after more than fifty years many recollections come back to me with force and vividness' (*J. H. Bridges*, p. 60) typify the impression made by all his contributions.

It would, on the face of it, be unnatural that he should invent a scene for Arnold and Clough to enact under their own names. The main substance of that scene conflicts with no other biographical records (the only possibly fictitious element is Arnold's role as a master in 1850, and even that cannot be proved so) and is confirmed by what is known of Arnold's frequent visits to Rugby and his intimacy with its masters. Moreover, the detail of that intimacy, the imponderables of tone and turns of phrase, is that of contemporary letters and recorded conversations, mostly still unpublished in 1900. It is not then rash to plead for the acceptance of the ninth chapter as a contribution to the biography of Arnold.

But that may not be its only value.

IV

Whereas the value of the personal portraits in Butler's story is corroborative and picturesque, making defined and dramatic a general impression of the young Arnold and his friends which we can draw from other sources, his delighted recognition of *In Memoriam*, if accepted, contributes something new to our view of Arnold as poet and critic. From what has preceded it in the chapter it derives a persuasiveness which might be lacking if it stood alone. Lacking, not so much because no other evidence exists that Arnold and Clough liked *In Memoriam*; but because some details may at first sight seem to some readers unconvincing. There is at least one factual inaccuracy; Arnold was a boy of ten when Hallam died, so that even if he had met him, he would not speak of him like this: 'Hallam? Oh, yes, I saw him once. He was unlike other men. But it needed friendship to understand it.' (The personal acquaintance of Tennyson and Arnold at this date—which is, I think, implied in the 'Alfred'—is, though not well attested, not impossible;¹ and the quick assurance of his authorship of the anonymous poem is a response shared by many early readers.)² It may be that Butler is 'hovering', to use his own word, nearer to 'fiction', eking out a memory with invented detail; the 'tone' of earnest conversation is generally less easy to recall than banter. And there is another possibility, a reason why Butler might 'hover' towards fiction just here. He is concerned to emphasize a pattern in recurrence. The friendships of Tennyson

¹ Hallam Tennyson says that his father 'had known [Arnold] at Coniston, as a young man just entering on life' (*Tennyson: A Memoir*, ii. 225). Tennyson was at Tent Lodge, Coniston, in the late summer of 1850, but no meeting is recorded. They certainly met at Coniston in 1857, and were then already friends (Charles Tennyson, *Alfred Tennyson*, 1949, p. 306); in 1855 Tennyson writes 'I have already an affection for him' and speaks of 'The Merman' as 'an old favourite of mine' (*Memoir*, i. 410). It could be assumed that they met in London before 1850 (Arnold was 'a young man just entering on life' any time from 1844) and that Hallam Tennyson had confused this with the 1857 meeting.

² T. R. Lounsbury, *The Life and Times of Tennyson (from 1809 to 1850)* (New Haven, 1915), pp. 617-19.

and Hallam, of Arnold and Clough, of Gordon and Fleming, are implicitly compared; *In Memoriam*, 'Thyrsis', and in its tiny way *The Three Friends*, dissolve into a single evocation of youthful friendship.¹ With this intention in mind he might wish to enlarge his memories. But that surely is all that can be said against the passage. Details may be invented; but to turn suddenly from reporting to invention in the main *fact* of the chapter—that Clough and Arnold read *In Memoriam* together at Rugby in the month of its publication, and were delighted—would seem strange.² It is best to accept it as true in essence if not in all details; and then to consider how it both modifies and accords with our present view of Arnold's response to Tennyson.³

As I said, it contributes something new—it could not have been confidently guessed; yet it can be recognized as not merely possible, but even as helping to explain the remarks on Tennyson that Arnold made elsewhere. At least it is not a specific contradiction; for (unless it be obliquely referred to in 'The Scholar Gipsy', as many contemporaries believed but Arnold denied)⁴ *In Memoriam*, Tennyson's greatest poem, appearing at the outset of Arnold's own career as a poet, receives no mention from him in letters or published work. And the reader of Arnold's generally impatient remarks in the letters to Clough:

1847: 'dawdling with [the] painted shell [of the Universe]'

1855 (the *Maud* volume): 'a lamentable production . . . thoroughly and intensely provincial'

1861: 'I care for his productions less and less'⁵

¹ 'Thyrsis' is referred to on p. 108 as 'another noble garland of friendship'. There is also a reference to the 'glorification of school friendships' in *Comingsby*, and a quotation.

² And, as it happens, contrary to a stated principle of Butler's in his historical plays: 'we may not construct scenes and characters out of our own imagination, and then, as has been said "do some historical events or personages the compliment of borrowing their names"'. Even where invention is permitted, it must be within narrow bounds, and jealously guarded from transgression.' *Charles I* (1874), pp. xvii-xviii.

³ In Clough's case there is less to discuss; what little is recorded of his views is already favourable to Tennyson, with the single exception of his 'Decade' speech, and that appears to have been pro-Wordsworth rather than anti-Tennyson. Arnold's letters to him clearly suggest that Clough thinks better of Tennyson than he does, and that at that date he stands nearer to him as a poet, at least in intention. Clough did not resist imitation (*L.C.*, p. 61, and cf. 'Natura Naturans') and is in one important respect more Tennyson's kind of poet than Arnold's; the line through *The Princess*, *The Bothie*, and *Maud* as narratives of contemporary life is clear, and was recognized by some contemporary critics. Clough's friendship with Tennyson in the last ten years of his life was close; he visited Farringford, heard and admired the first three Idylls before publication (*P. and P.R.*, pp. 232, 235) and in the last year of his life joined the Tennysons 'in the valley of Caunteretz'.

⁴ Lines 182-90. Some of the evidence and arguments are set out by Lowry and Tinker (*Commentary*, pp. 209-11) but not the use of the stanza on the title-page of Joseph Jacobs's 1892 study of *In Memoriam*, nor the argument from the context, which suggests a living writer. But it is impossible to press the identification in face of Arnold's definite statement thirty years later that he intended Goethe, surprising though this may seem.

⁵ *L.C.*, pp. 63, 147, 154.

and of the more reasoned censures in the last Homer lecture and the later letters, is left asking 'But what about *In Memoriam*?' There is no answer: the poem is never named, nor is Tennyson even referred to in letters between 1848 and 1853. At least then a space is left into which the first impressions recorded by Butler ('beautiful, luminous') may be slipped. And there are bits of the pattern which show some relation to them. Caring 'less' implies having cared 'more'; and there is a more revealing admission:

One has him so in one's head, one cannot help imitating him sometimes; but except in the last lines I thought I had kept him out of 'Sohrab and Rustum'. Mark any other places you notice, for I should wish to alter such.¹

These sentences in a letter to John Duke Coleridge perhaps best formulate Arnold's mixed response: a fascinated familiarity with Tennyson's poetry, and a self-protective resistance to it, especially in his own poetry, and especially in one poem. The familiarity is consistent with Butler's account, as also the recorded enthusiasm for Tennyson in Arnold's Oxford set after the appearance of the 1842 volumes, when his 'name' was 'on everyone's lips . . . portions of [the poems] repeatedly set for translation into Latin or Greek verse . . . read and re-read so habitually that there were many of us who could repeat page after page from memory'.² And though it may be assumed that Arnold, like Clough, would oppose the motion up for debate at the 'Decade' about 1844, 'That Tennyson is a greater poet than Wordsworth',³ the compliment implied in such a motion should not be overlooked.

The resistance to Tennyson as a poetic influence is a reaction natural in a poet half a generation younger, as yet unestablished, and fighting, as a poet, for his independent life. Fighting, perhaps against the spell laid upon his own poetic sensibilities, certainly against the tendency of critics to 'place' his own early poems as Tennysonian. Reviewers and friends (J. D. Coleridge was both) had noted Tennysonian echoes, both in *The Strayed Reveller* and the *Poems* of 1853, *Blackwood's* actually rebuking the unknown author for being too imitative in 'Myrcerinus', and being 'directly reminded of one of Alfred's early extravaganzas' by 'The Forsaken Merchant'.⁴ In November 1853 Arnold had Clough as well as Coleridge to contend with, and wrote to him twice in five days defending himself against the charge of being Tennysonian in 'Sohrab'. He concedes one or two lines—'rather Tennysonian—at any rate it is not good'.⁵ In the same letter

¹ *Life and Correspondence of Lord Coleridge* (1904), i. 210; letter of 1853.

² This is recalled by Bradley from October 1842; he had been away from Oxford for a year and had then met Tennyson at the Lushingtons' (*Tennyson: A Memoir*, i. 205-6). Cf. Knight, p. 57.

³ *P. and P.R.* i. 25; Shairp's recollections. Bradley reports that Shairp also spoke for Wordsworth (Knight, p. 139).

⁴ September 1849, pp. 340-6; and cf. *Fraser's*, May 1849, pp. 570-86.

⁵ *L.C.*, pp. 145-6.

the belittling of 'The Scholar Gipsy', Clough's favourite in the volume,¹ as having only a 'pleasing melancholy' may be one more move against the Tennysonian, and perhaps particularly against *In Memoriam*, parts of which 'The Scholar Gipsy' approaches in '*couleur locale*'² as well as in mood. Arnold had his own view of it; it was a poem for the 'interior company' who shared the same reminiscences, not for the 'complaining millions of men' who needed something to 'animate and ennoble'.³

The 1853 Preface also shows Arnold trying to uproot and reject a kind of poetry which is congenial to one part of his nature, and which is of the same kind as *In Memoriam*. The Preface never mentions Tennyson; but it implies him, in more than one passage, and if *Empedocles* is to be rejected, so too is *In Memoriam*, as the 'dialogue of the mind with itself' (there could not be a more apt description), as the 'allegory of the state of one's own mind', and as representing a 'situation . . . in which the suffering finds no vent in action . . . something morbid . . . something monotonous . . . painful, not tragic'. Again, Tennyson's manner is glanced at when Arnold pleads for 'the subordinate character of expression'; clearly, the 'hand' which he offers to guide the 'young writer' bewildered by the 'number of existing works capable of attracting [his] attention' will lead him firmly away from Tennyson, as from Keats and Alexander Smith ('Keats, Tennyson, et id genus omne', who must cause 'perplexity' to 'young writers');⁴ away from 'exquisite bits and images', from poetry that adds 'zest to our melancholy and grace to our dreams'.⁵ Away from all this; towards what, the Preface is there to define, and 'Sohrab and Rustum' to exemplify. 'In its poor way Sohrab and Rustum animates';⁶ it pleased him better than anything else he had done, the material was good, and that was everything; it was galling to be told on all sides that even this poem was Tennysonian, and to have 'The Scholar Gipsy' preferred.⁷ 'But this is not what we want.'

In Arnold's later judgements on Tennyson he makes his grounds for complaint more specific. That he should become harsher in the early eighteenth-sixties is explicable. While he increasingly demanded that literature should be 'adequate', should powerfully apply 'ideas' to life; while he advanced, not merely with the times but ahead of them, as one of the 'sharpshooters, the quick-witted audacious light troops',⁸ Tennyson receded further from him. But as Tennyson became less 'adequate', he became more popular. Arnold was alive to the danger to 'culture' here. Allowing Tennyson

¹ *P. and P.R.* ii. 214; letter to C. E. Norton, 1853.

² Letter to Tom Arnold, 1857 (Ward, p. 54).

³ *L.C.*, p. 146.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 146.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 97; letter of (?) late 1848.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 147.

⁷ The preference persists, but especially perhaps among Oxford men, for whom Arnold admitted that he primarily wrote it.

⁸ 'Joubert', lecture of 1863; *Essays in Criticism* (1865).

'temperament and artistic skill'¹ and 'poetic sentiment',² he saw him as 'deficient in intellectual power'³—his 'reach of mind is petty'.⁴ In short, he is 'not . . . a great and powerful spirit in any line'.⁵ Again the context shows that Arnold is fighting, this time for the superiority of Wordsworth and Goethe, the priests and sages of poetry. He had been fighting especially for Wordsworth in the last Homer lectures, on which he commented:

Tennyson's devoted adherents will be very angry with me, but their ridiculous elevation of him above Wordsworth made me determined to say what I did.⁶

It is in this that we come nearest to the centre of his objection; and the re-affirming of one of the positions taken up in the 1853 Preface is clear.

In his final lectures Arnold, with his critics in mind, is concerned to draw distinctions important to him. He brings out the 'true Homeric plainness' and the 'natural simplicity' of Wordsworth, partly through a contrast, by description and example, with Tennyson's 'subtle sophistication', 'distilled thoughts in distilled words'.⁷ To this he devotes some four pages,⁸ of which one sentence sufficiently indicates his position. Spedding, he has said, is wrong in finding Homeric plainness of thought and speech in Tennyson:

I answer that these I do not find there at all. Mr. Tennyson is a most distinguished and charming poet; but the very essential characteristic of his poetry is, it seems to me, an extreme subtlety and curious elaborateness of thought, an extreme subtlety and curious elaborateness of style. In the best and most characteristic productions of his genius, these characteristics are most prominent.

He gives half a dozen examples, mainly from heroic poems, of a 'way of speaking . . . the least *plain*, the most *unHomeric*, which can possibly be conceived'. Then, to show that, when Tennyson tries to be simple, he 'can only attain a semblance of simplicity', 'artificial simplicity', or '*simplesse*', he puts two passages from 'Dora' beside two from 'Michael'. No examples are drawn from *In Memoriam*, and it may be by inference excluded from condemnation in this footnote:

In lyrical poetry, in the direct expression of personal feeling, the most subtle genius may, under the momentary pressure of passion, express itself simply. Even here, however, the native tendency will generally be discernible.

¹ *Letters*, i. 127 (1860).

² *Ibid.* ii. 9 (1869).

³ *Ibid.* i. 127 (1860).

⁴ *From a Victorian Post-bag* (1926), p. 75 (letter to Llewelyn Davies, 1863).

⁵ *Letters*, i. 239 (1864).

⁶ *Ibid.* i. 165 (1862).

⁷ In a letter to Palgrave discussing his own poems in 1869 (G. W. E. Russell, *Matthew Arnold* (1904), pp. 41-43), Arnold incidentally draws a further distinction, and a severe one, between Virgil's 'natural *propriety* of diction and rhythm' and the style of the *Idylls*, 'something dainty and *tourmenté*'. He here admits that 'Sohrab' has 'something, not dainty, but *tourmenté*'.

⁸ Pp. 54-58 in the first edition of *Last Words*, 1862; pp. 413-16 in the Oxford edition (1914).

Lyric poetry, when Tennyson is being thought of, is a very large exclusion; but Arnold is, here as in the 1853 Preface, preoccupied with the Great Poem and the Grand Style. This admitted, it would still be open to Arnold to allow natural simplicity to

He put our lives so far apart
We cannot hear each other speak.

Apart from this passage, there is no overt reference to Tennyson in Arnold's published work. But, perhaps because of what he had said in his lecture, he was asked two years later to review the *Enoch Arden* volume for the *Spectator*—and was much tempted. The poem itself he thought 'very good indeed—perhaps the best thing Tennyson has done';¹ but he could not write about Tennyson without saying all he thought, and that might be attributed to 'odious motives'. (One recalls his wish to keep free of 'the ignoble saturnalia of personal passions'.) Here is already shaping itself his principle of not writing about contemporary literature:

In general I do not write about the literary performances of living contemporaries or contemporaries only recently dead²

—a self-denying ordinance which explains many omissions in his criticism. He wished that Stopford Brooke had ended his survey of English literature at 1832:

No man can trust himself to speak of his own time and his own contemporaries with the same sureness of judgment and the same proportion as of times past.³

In other words, 'disinterestedness' on contemporary literature was impossible. What Arnold did publish, still more what he wrote privately of Tennyson, confirms this; the murmur of impersonal (not 'odious') axe-grinding is always there—Tennyson is not Homer, or not Goethe, or not Wordsworth, not a 'complete magister vitae'; and so 'not what we want'.

But the strength of Tennyson's influence, on poetry, on standards of criticism, and up to a point on Arnold himself, is measurable by Arnold's resistance. It suggests some degree of captivity. There are besides many indications that Arnold's view of poetry was not uniformly austere, not solely controlled by 'what we want', what is 'important for us'. Inconsistent, out-of-date personal tastes break through; and one poet, first damned for the 'harm he has done to English poetry', wins upon Arnold by his 'natural magic'. (It is too often forgotten that Arnold gives this equal weight with 'moral profundity'.) There is a breach in the wall. And Arnold's own instinctive pleased response is half betrayed even in the

¹ *Letters*, i. 239 (1864). Cf. letter to J. D. Coleridge, op. cit. ii. 125–6—'one of the two or three very best things Tennyson has done'.

² *Letters*, ii. 376 (1888).

³ Review of 1877, collected in *Mixed Essays*, 1879.

moment of resistance: the 'exquisite bits and images' of 'modern poetry' were after all 'exquisite'; 'the most subtle genius' is not a phrase of condemnation, and it is admitted that even this, in lyric, may 'under the momentary pressure of passion, express itself simply'. When brought together and related to his own work in criticism and poetry, Arnold's strictures on Tennyson make sense, and are not merely severe; they are certainly not discordant with delight in *In Memoriam*. No admirer of both poets, least of all one who thinks *In Memoriam* Tennyson's greatest poem and 'Thyrsis' Arnold's, could be content to suspect Arnold's silence on that poem to be that of insensitiveness. I hope my resuscitation of Arthur Butler's story may be seen as bringing an authentic voice into that silence: perhaps even a 'floating echo' from Arnold's deep-buried 'central stream of what we feel indeed'.

Addenda

1. Since this article went to press there has appeared John Curgenven's valuable essay 'Theodore Walrond: friend of Arnold and Clough' (*Durham University Journal*, xlv, 2, March 1952), containing much new information, which supplements, without conflicting with, what is said above.
2. I have also found a reminiscence linking Arnold and *In Memoriam* in William Knight's *Retrospects* (1904), p. 196: 'I remember and can now hear, his musical quotation of the lines "Leave thou thy sister when she prays [here follows the rest of the stanza, xxx. 6-8]".'
3. W. F. Connell (*The Educational Thought and Influence of Matthew Arnold*, 1950, p. 15, n. 1) is aware of Butler's book but considers it 'sadly astray' in details.

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

'HIPPOPOTAMUS' IN OLD ENGLISH

THE most recent edition of *The Letter of Alexander the Great to Aristotle*¹ contains the following passage at p. 15, line 19 to p. 16, line 3 (f. 119 a-b of MS. Cotton Vitellius A. xv, by the old numbering):

þ was þonne mera mengeo on onsione maran & un [hy]rlicran þonne ða elpendas in ðone gr[und] þære ða & betweoh ða yða þæs wæteres þa men besencte . . .

This corresponds to the following in the Latin of MS. C.C.C. Oxon. 82, as given in the appendix, p. 84:

maiores elephantorum corporum hyppotami inter profundos aquarum emersi apparuerunt gurgites raptosque in uerticem crudeli pena uiros flentibus nobis absumpserunt.

Other manuscripts of the Latin text read, according to the apparatus, *hyppopotami*, *hippopotami* instead of the syncopated *hyppotami*.

Thus 'hippopotamus' is apparently rendered by OE. *mere* 'mare'. The present form is cited in the glossary under that word, together with two other occurrences of it (used of cow-elephants) from *Wonders of the East*.

Alexander's Letter was edited earlier by Cockayne² and Baskervill,³ and Cockayne's text was collated by Holder.⁴ These editors both read *mera*, and Holder made no comment; nor did Bradley and Sisam, in their article on the text,⁵ say anything on the point. Nobody seems to have remarked upon the Old English translator's unexpectedly precise knowledge of the sex of the hippopotamuses.

In fact, *mera* does not exist. The manuscript reads, plainly it seems to me, *nicra*. If there were any doubt about it, the sequel a few lines farther on would surely clinch the matter (p. 16, lines 9-13):

& sona þæs ðe hie inne wæron swa wæron þa *nicoras* gearwe . . . & swa picce hie in þære ea aweollon swa æmettan ða *nicras* . . .

Only the first of these corresponds directly to the Latin, which again has *hyppotami*, *hippopotami*, and variants.

The word *nicras* (*nicra*) in this text has suffered much from editors. In

¹ In S. Rypins, *Three Old English Prose Texts* (E.E.T.S., O.S. 161, 1924). The lineation, preserved in the edition, is here ignored.

² In *Narratiunculae Anglice Conscriptae* (London, 1861). Cockayne's text of the relevant part of the sentence is quoted in Bosworth-Toller s.v. *un-hirlic*.

³ *Anglia*, iv (1881), 139-67. His text was based on a collation by Wülcker.

⁴ *Anglia*, i (1878), 507-12.

⁵ *M.L.R.* xiv (1919), 202-5.

the passage just quoted Cockayne and Baskervill both read *ðam cras* instead of *ða nicras*, as noted by Rypins¹ and by Bradley and Sisam. Justice should now be done to it in the earlier passage as well.

NORMAN DAVIS

HENRY FINCH AND SHAKESPEARE

21 and 23 March 1593

Debate, in the House of Commons, on the 'Bill against Aliens selling by way of retail any Foreign Commodities etc.'²

Mr. Finch³ spake for the Strangers and said . . . In the days of Queen Mary, when our Cause was as theirs is now, those Countries [i.e. the Low Countries especially] did allow us that liberty, which now we seek to deny them. They are strangers now, we may be strangers hereafter. So let us do as we would be done unto⁴ [end of Mr. Finch's speech].

c. 1593

The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore

Scene VI, written in Shakespeare's hand⁵

[More, addressing a crowd which is rioting against the alien merchants]

. . . go you to Fraunc or Flanders
to any Iarman province, Spane or
Portigall . . .

why you must needs be straingers . . .

. . . what would you thinck
to be thus usd, this is the straingers
case

and this your mountainish inhumanyty.

[All.] Faith a saies trewe lets do as
we may be doon by.

P. MAAS

¹ M.L.N. xxxii (1917), 95.

² From *The Journals of all the Parliaments during the Reign of Queen Elizabeth . . . collected by Sir Simonds D'Ewes* (London, 1682), pp. 505-9.

³ Henry Finch, 1558-1625, then Member for Canterbury, knighted 1616. Author of *NOMOTEXNIA* (London, 1613). Cf. *D.N.B.*

⁴ The so-called Golden Rule (extensive evidence in Stevenson's *Book of Proverbs . . .*, 1949, pp. 2014-16), more appropriate for a statesman than a riotous crowd.

⁵ B.M. MS. Harl. 7368, fol. 9^r; cf. A. W. Pollard, W. W. Greg . . ., *Shakespeare's Hand in the Play of Sir Thomas More* (Cambridge, 1923), pp. 214 f., 240, ll. 127-141; Canon John Shirley in the Introduction to his edition of the play (Canterbury, 1938), pp. xiii f.; S. A. Tannenbaum, *Anthony Munday with 'Sir Thomas Moore': a Concise Bibliography* (New York, 1942); B. Stirling, *The Populace in Shakespeare* (New York, 1949), pp. 157-9, 179; R. C. Bald, 'The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore', *Shakespeare Survey*, 2 (1949), 44-65 (with 4 plates).

'MAINLY': *PARADISE LOST*, XI. 519

ADAM, having been shown the lazar-house of human diseases, asks:

Can thus
Th' Image of God . . .
To such unsightly sufferings be debas't
Under inhuman pains? . . . (xi. 507-11)
Thir Makers Image, answerd *Michael*, then
Forsook them, when themselves they villifi'd
To serve ungovern'd appetite, and took
His image whom they serv'd, a brutish vice,
Inductive mainly to the sin of *Eve*. (xi. 515-19)

In effect they have suffered something of the change symbolized by Comus's crew, and from the same cause of sensual indulgence.

The last line, 'Inductive mainly to the sin of Eve', has been taken by all editors, from Newton down, to mean that gratification of her appetite or mere sensual indulgence was Eve's chief inducement to eat of the fruit. Thus Verity comments: 'Eve's main inducement (he says) to eat of the fruit was appetite; this agrees with the account in ix. 740, 741.' But it does not agree with the whole long and intricate account of the temptation and fall of Eve; it is a crude simplification of the subtle story told by the poet, where appetite is only mentioned as the last incentive. This line in fact, as commonly interpreted, becomes one of those inconsistencies in the account of the Fall which Professor Waldock made much of.

The interpretation of the line turns on the word 'mainly', which is used on this sole occasion in Milton's poetry. The sense given it by Milton's editors is the modern sense, sense 3 in the *O.E.D.*: 'For the most part; in the main; as the chief thing, chiefly, principally.' The first example of this use cited by the *O.E.D.* is our line from *Paradise Lost*, followed by '1695 Woodward *Nat. Hist. Earth*'. But the prevalent sense in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and one surviving to the end of the eighteenth, was the now obsolete sense 2 in the *O.E.D.*: 'In a great degree; greatly, considerably, very much, a great deal.' There are seen to be two overwhelming reasons for taking Milton's use of the word in this latter sense: (1) it was the common usage of the time; (2) it alone is consistent with the poet's account of the temptation and fall of Eve. The line should therefore be glossed, 'A strong or great (not the chief) inducement to the sin of Eve'.

B. A. WRIGHT

THE JACOBITES, CHARLES MOLLOY, AND COMMON SENSE

THE political journal *Common Sense*, edited and partly written by Charles Molloy, is one of the most widely known of its class in the eighteenth century. Plans for its first appearance, as indeed for most other such papers, with specific names of expected contributors and financial backers, have previously been unknown. While conducting researches of another character among the Stuart Papers at Windsor, I fortunately stumbled upon evidence which tells more than most contemporaries knew. For the use of this material I wish to acknowledge the gracious permission of Her Majesty the Queen.

Most of the relevant letters are from the Old Pretender, then despondent of his hopes for a return to England, to his agent at Paris, Daniel O'Brien, and from O'Brien to James. Discussion of the foundation of a new paper begins in a letter from the Pretender of 29 August 1736 (Windsor Stuart Papers 189, no. 80), in which he writes to O'Brien:

I have received yours of the 13th August, with a letter of Molloy. . . . It cannot
[the King]
but be of advantage to Andrew that some Political paper writ with a view to
it
favor 1200 should be printed & published in Antwerp, I shall write soon to
Cecille
C. Holmes on the subject That If Molloy's project of publishing such a paper be
friends
thought adviseable there, my 188 may be assisting to it both with their purse
D. B.
& with their advice, I shall write in the same sense to Mr. Darcy. But you must
not name either Darcy or Holmes to Molloy, It will be sufficient to let him
know That I shall write into Antwerp on his subject, & you will also let him know
That I am very sensible of his past & present zeal for Antony [probably the
Pretender].

The interlineations are those of O'Brien when he himself deciphered the letter. 'C. Cecille' was Colonel William Cecil, a relation of the Earl of Salisbury, and 'D. B.' was the Duchess of Buckingham. Both were active and ardent Jacobites.

As he promised, James wrote to Cecil on 2 October (W.S.P. 190, no. 12):

You have heard as I understand a good dale about Mist, I have no reason to think him otherways than an honest man & attatched to my Cause, but were he otherways, it is not in his power to betray secrets, for he was never let into any, he has now left off inserting any thing of politick matters in his Journal, which is I think a loss, for such sort of things still do good more or less in the publick, And it were to be wished something of that kind could be renewed, there is one

Molloy who you may have heard of, he is a man of good character, & who has been already used to such sort of matters by the share he had in Mist papers, this person now offers his service for writing & publishing a paper of that nature, But he will want some assistance for the expence of it; I wish therefore you would speak to some friends on this head, in hopes they may be inclined to forward what cannot but be of use to my Cause, & that they may at the same time give such directions & advices about such papers as may be thought proper.

I reckon the Dss of Bm may be in England by the time you get this, If she be, pray communicate this letter to her. . . .

Fresh news came over with George Kelly, a fellow conspirator of Atterbury, when he escaped from the Tower and made his way to Paris. O'Brien wrote to James about it in his usual French on 4 February 1737 (W.S.P. 194, no. 10).

Kelly ma dit que le sr molloy, dont il ma beaucoup vanté la probité, alloit
 executer le plan quil ma communiqué icy, et que jay envoyez a ^{v[otre] m[ajesté]} 1766 ;
 pour mettre aujour un nouveaux papier, qui put tenir lieu de celluy de fog, mais
 Les amis du Roy en Ang[leterre] re
 que pour le soutenir il seroit absolumt necessaire, que 188
 luy fissent toucher 30 livres sterlings par année surtout — dans ces commencemts
 ou il ne pourroit quy perdre.

Kelly regarde ce nouveaux papier, comme etant extrememt essentiel au ser-
 Roy
 vice de richard il est persuadé quil se soustiendra avec reputation, vù les per-
 sonnes qui promettent dy travailler,

mr pope, qui jusqua present, a evité dentrer dans aucune affaire de party, a
 offert a molloy tout les secours qui dependront de luy, et meme den ecrire
 plusieurs, a condition pourtant, quil tiendrait le cas secret, mylord chesterfield
 sest offert dy travailler conjointemt avec ses amis, mylord Grange, frere du
 feu duc de mar a offert a molloy la mesme chose; ainsy avec ces secours, ce papier
 ne sçauroit manquer de paroître avec succès, et je compte pour beaucoup que mr
 pope, et mylord chesterfield, sen meslent.

on netoit pas encore convenus, du titre que lon donneroit au dit papier, lors-
 que mr Kelly partit dangleterre.

We seem to have Kelly's authority for the names of the promised contri-
 butors. Whether he had any personal knowledge of their offers, or accepted
 the word of Molloy, O'Brien does not say.

In February *Common Sense, or the Englishman's Journal*, began to appear. Cecil, the Duchess, and their associates must have delayed payment, for Kelly wrote to O'Brien from the house of the exiled Duke of Ormonde at Avignon on 3 May a letter which O'Brien forwarded to his master in another of 13 May (W.S.P. 196, nos. 14 and 80).

I hope You have not forgot honest Molloy, who can never carry on his paper

without the help I mention'd to you; I could get his Grace [Ormonde] to write in his favour; but as You were so kind as to promise it, That will be sufficient.

Perhaps a few days later O'Brien sent on a translation of an extract from a letter from Cecil dated 5 May (W.S.P. 196, no. 30).

La conduite de vos amis icy a repondu pleinemt a ceque v[otre] m[ajesté] leurs avoit recommande par mon cannal, et toutes les affaires en general se passent, comme nous le pourions desirer.

Kelly's letter arrived first at Albano, where the Pretender was spending his *villeggiatura*, and drew a reply dated 29 May (W.S.P. 197, no. 48).

Je remarque ce que Kelly vous mande . . . au Sujet de Molloy, dont vous ne faites point mention, Mais Je suppose qu'il étoit question de me demander de l'argent pour les frais de son *Journal*, Il seroit fort raisonnable pour moy d'y contribuer, mais vous sçavez ma situation, et s'il est vrai que J'ai quelques amis dans ce pais-la, il seroit bien honteux pour eux de ne pas donner quelques Guinea's pour un tel object.

Italics are in this case deciphered words.

O'Brien responded in the same vein on 17 June (W.S.P. 198, no. 12).

J'y ecrit il y a quelque temps a kelly au sujet de molloy, a peu pres les mesmes choses que *Le Roy* me mande actuellemt, et veritablemt il seroit honteux pour *Les amis du Roy en Angre* de ne pas ayder molloy a soutenir son journal, qui reussit tres bien, et je ne doute meme qu'ils ne layent desja fait.

The next letter from Cecil to the Pretender does not mention Molloy or his paper (W.S.P. 199, no. 4). On 23 July Molloy makes his only contribution to the correspondence—a letter to 'King James III' (W.S.P. 199, no. 108).

I have long had a Desire of makeing a Declaration of my Duty and Zeal to your Majesty by a personal address. . . .

I beg leave to assure your Majesty that these poor Talents which It has pleas'd God to give me shal alwayes be employd in your Royall Service, and however I may err for want of Judgment and Capacity, I shal never fail in point of Zeal or Duty, Who am

Here the matter closes. From time to time in the Stuart Papers some Jacobite mentions *Common Sense* with approval, and that is all. Perhaps the friends of the Duchess of Buckingham and William Cecil paid without delay when another instalment was due; perhaps Molloy found better support for his writings among the public at large than he received from the generally impecunious Jacobites. Probably his finances were later made to rest on the Whigs in opposition to Walpole, as the content of the journal suggests. However that may be, the possibility of some connexion between Molloy's venture and Pope, ostentatiously aloof from politics, is intriguing;

and th
ready

CO

THE
Coler
a thir
tax on
dome
the re
Essay
adver
that
dedic
mised
a seco
the p
tions,
the p
Son
lowin
You k
Allen
parlia
'I sho
intere

When
nal ex
tion
sugge
by C
In
origi
numb
quots
ment
the la

¹ A
1938)
² A

and the ambiguity of sponsorship of *Common Sense* is a caution against too ready acceptance of the judgements of contemporaries.

GEORGE HILTON JONES

COLERIDGE'S *THE WATCHMAN*: DECLINE AND FALL

THE formal history of *The Watchman* begins with the prospectus that Coleridge had printed early in 1796. In it he proposed the publication of a thirty-two-page miscellany every eighth day (in order to avoid the stamp tax on weeklies), which should contain (i) current history, both foreign and domestic, (ii) speeches in Parliament, and selected annotated speeches from the reign of Charles I onwards during the recesses, and (iii) 'Original Essays and Poetry, chiefly or altogether political'. There were to be no advertisements, and indeed there were none. Finally, Coleridge promised that 'whatever powers or acquirements the Editor possesses, he will dedicate *entirely* to this work . . .'. The first number was originally promised for 5 February 1796; actually it appeared on 1 March, before which a second prospectus was printed. This prospectus added another item to the proposed contents, (iv) reviews of interesting and important publications, and stated that the aim of *The Watchman* would be 'to supply at once the places of a review, newspaper, and annual register!!!'

Some time in February Robert Allen communicated to Coleridge the following prophecy of their friend, George L. Tuckett:

You know how subject Coleridge is to fits of idleness. Now, I'll lay any wager, Allen, that after three or four numbers the sheets will contain nothing but parliamentary debates, and Coleridge will add a note at the bottom of the page: 'I should think myself deficient in my duty to the Public if I did not give these interesting debates at full length.'¹

When *The Watchman* ceased publication with its tenth number, the nominal explanation was that 'the Work does not pay its expenses'.² Examination of the contents, however, seems to bear out Tuckett's prophecy and suggests that the death of *The Watchman* is to be explained at least in part by Coleridge's indolence and loss of interest in the work.

In the first number twenty-eight of the thirty-two pages represent original writing or original summary of materials. Throughout the ten numbers, however, there is a steady increase in the amount of direct quotation, whether of letters to the editor, diplomatic and political documents, poetry, or accounts from other newspapers and journals, until, in the last three numbers, there is very little that is even apparently original.

¹ As quoted in Lawrence Hanson, *The Life of S. T. Coleridge: the Early Years* (London, 1938), p. 99.

² 'Address to the Readers', *The Watchman*, p. 324.

In the second number there are twenty original pages and twelve of borrowed material, all of it acknowledged. With the third number Coleridge's unacknowledged borrowings begin to appear;¹ in this number there are only eighteen original pages. In the fourth number fifteen pages are original; in each of the fifth, sixth, and seventh numbers, ten pages; in the eighth number six pages; and in the ninth only four.

The tenth and last number (published on 13 May 1796) seems at first sight to contain a little more original work than its immediate predecessor, about five pages of the thirty-two. Professor Patton finds no unacknowledged borrowings here. Some twenty-seven pages are made up of direct quotations and extracts from such diverse items as Dr. Beddoes's *Postscript to the Defense of the Bill of Rights*, Dr. Fothergill's *Essay on the Abuse of Spirituous Liquors*, President Washington's message to the House of Representatives, a report on agriculture from the *Monthly Magazine*, official war bulletins from France, a recently published *History of Poland*, and the proceedings of a trial before the Court of King's Bench. The chief piece of apparently original writing is the opening essay (pp. 293-6 of *The Watchman*), an ironic petition supposed to have been written in Denmark in 1660 on behalf of the oppressed populace. The essay is Coleridge's, but it represents, none the less, another unacknowledged borrowing, hitherto unnoticed by Coleridge scholars. With the exception of a very few minor changes, the essay is identical with the peroration of the last of the political lectures delivered at Bristol, *The Plot Discovered*, published in November 1795.²

Thus the strictly original material in the tenth number is reduced to less than two pages, of which the largest single item is Coleridge's farewell address to his readers on the last page (p. 324). Here he writes that some readers said that there was not enough original composition, some that there was too much! His parting words are: 'I have endeavoured to do well. And it must be attributed to defect of ability, not of inclination or effort, if the words of the Prophet be altogether applicable to me, "O Watchman! thou hast watched in vain!"' The evidence here assembled more nearly supports Tuckett's prophetic words than Coleridge's final editorial comments, despite their invocation of the authority of a greater prophet.

S. F. JOHNSON

¹ The chief unacknowledged borrowings are listed by Lewis Patton in a note to his article, 'Coleridge and the "Enquirer" Series', *R.E.S.*, xvi (1940), 188-9. Professor Patton's complete list may be found on p. cxxi of his edition of *The Watchman* (unpublished dissertation, Yale University, 1937); he has found unacknowledged borrowings in six of the ten numbers (iii-vi and viii-ix inclusive).

² A variant title is *A Protest Against Certain Bills*. The lecture was reprinted and is most readily available in *Essays on His Own Times*, edited by Sara Coleridge (London, 1850), i, 56-98; the original of the tenth *Watchman* essay appears there on pages 94-98.

REVIEWS

The Literature of the Anglo-Saxons. By G. K. ANDERSON. Pp. ix+431. Princeton: Princeton University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1950. 30s. net.

A comprehensive and detailed history of Anglo-Saxon literature is one of the desiderata of scholarship, and one would have thought that an author who had cast his net as widely as Professor Anderson's bibliographies suggest would have been able to fill the gap. But his work is marred by so many errors from which the works cited in the bibliography could have saved him, that one must suppose that it was written hastily and without subsequent revision. Thus, though a discussion of the framework of Anglo-Saxon society at the beginning is well in place, it would be difficult to uphold his division into three classes, *eorlas*, *ceorlas*, and *freomen*. It is surely universally held that all classes that are not servile are covered in the term 'freemen'; these are not a class separate from the nobles and peasants. Nor is there to my knowledge any evidence for the claim that a male had a higher *wergild* than the corresponding female. Many other historical statements are inaccurate: Durham plays no part in Northumbrian history or scholarship until 995; Essex and Middlesex are ignored in a statement that all the Germanic population north of the Thames was Anglian; Athelstan, not Edgar, was the first West Saxon king over a united England; and to say that the Mercians, during the reign of Offa, were being constantly threatened by the West Saxons is surely a complete reversal of the truth.

Professor Anderson is not the first writer on Anglo-Saxon literature to make blunders on historical matters, but unfortunately there are similar errors on what should be his own ground. It is evidently mere looseness of expression which gives the impression that he thinks Bede (whom he calls Abbot) wrote in English, and it may be a slip when Aldhelm seems to land among Northumbrian scholars or Simeon of Durham is said to write in Cambridge; but a student of literature should not muddle Wulfstan the Homilist with St. Wulfstan, and should know that Tiberius B 1 contains more than 'a small portion of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle'. One is not therefore surprised to find that the poem on the redemption of the Five Boroughs is totally misunderstood, and that the conclusions of Dr. K. Sisam on Cynewulf are ignored. In view of these and many similar shortcomings, one must conclude that the work cannot be recommended except for its bibliographies.

These include many items that are often missed. For example, he refers to Bonser's 'Survivals of Paganism in Anglo-Saxon England' in the *Transactions of the Birmingham Archaeological Society*. There are, as is inevitable when so wide a field is being covered, some omissions, such as Tait on the Anglo-Saxon boroughs, and various important articles in the *Transactions of the British Academy*, and Professor Anderson does not distinguish between editions and facsimiles. But few scholars, I believe, will fail to find some references new and

useful to them. It is greatly to be regretted that the author did not take more time to digest his reading before attempting a work of this range.

DOROTHY WHITELOCK

Piers Plowman and Scriptural Tradition. By D. W. ROBERTSON, JR. and BERNARD F. HUPPÉ. Pp. xi+259. (Princeton Studies in English No. 31.) Princeton: University Press, 1951; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1952. \$4.00; 25s. net.

Piers Plowman is remarkably rich in biblical quotations, and as the authors of this study point out, such quotations are an important element in the structure of the poem. It is therefore desirable that the reader should appreciate the poet's full purpose in using them. For the modern reader this is not easy. Even though one may be aware that, during the Middle Ages, the text of Holy Scripture was habitually seen as inseparable from the interpretations given to it by the exegetists, one is apt to lack an imaginative realization of the complexity of the medieval approach to the Bible. Langland himself gives the injunction: 'Go to the glose of the verse.' The injunction has been faithfully obeyed in this book, and all students of *Piers Plowman* must be grateful for an exposition of the meanings and associations probably attached by the poet to the texts which he quotes.

However, the discussion is not confined to the texts quoted. The authors' larger aim is to show that the poet had the *sentence*—the 'higher meaning'—of Scripture in mind even in passages where no direct quotation occurs. Consequently, they explain,

when a portion of the poem contained no Biblical text and could not be understood entirely from its context, we attempted to ascertain its Biblical milieu. . . . Most passages of this kind revealed a Biblical inspiration, often to the point of verbal similarity. Having limited the Biblical reference, we proceeded as before to consider the commentaries. (p. 16.)

This extension of the approach through Scripture necessarily involves a good deal of conjecture. The reader may not always agree that the similarities between *Piers Plowman* and traditional Biblical exegesis are as striking as is claimed, or that the passages mentioned do in fact require elucidation beyond that supplied by the poem. One wonders whether the authors do not sometimes unconsciously allow their interpretation of such passages to be influenced by their desire to find a reminiscence of the commentaries. For example, they suggest that the ploughmen in the Prologue symbolize 'the true followers of the prelatial life' (p. 19), and they give abundant evidence to prove that the ploughman was regarded by the exegetists as having a special symbolic significance. However, the evidence brought from the poem itself to show the relevance of this fact to Langland's presentation of the ploughmen seems disproportionately slight. The only reasons suggested for believing that the ploughmen of the Prologue do not represent 'simple peasants' are 'the position of pre-eminence accorded them' and 'the fact that they have proud imitators' (p. 17).

Undue prominence is perhaps given to casual words and phrases, particularly

those which may merely be used to supply the necessary alliteration. The exclamation 'Peter!' uttered by Piers on his first entry into the poem—

'Peter!' quod a plowman and put forth his hed (v. 544)

hardly seems qualified to bear the weight of significance given to it by the authors' view that it not only suggests the character of the guide sought by the pilgrims but also suggests their goal (p. 76).

Again, it appears unnecessary to assume, in commenting on the line 'And somme murthes to make as mynstralles conneth' (Prologue, 33), that the source of the figure 'making mirth' is to be found in such Scriptural texts as *Iubilate Deo, omnis terra* (p. 23). From the occurrences recorded by the *O.E.D.* and by Dr. Oakden the expression would seem to be one of the common stock of phrases in the vocabulary of Middle English alliterative poets from *Lazamon* onwards.

In the main, the modern English paraphrases of the text of the poem are both pleasing and accurate, but there are one or two renderings which one feels should not have been given without some discussion, as, for example, the interpretation of 'And han here witte at wille to worche 3if thei sholde' (Prologue, 37) as 'they allow their wills to rule their wits' (p. 22). The reason for appending the sentence 'the friars seek Christ not among the poor, as they should, but in the houses of wealthy burgesses' (p. 153) to the quotation

If any frere were founde there ich 3if the fyue shillynges;
Ne in none beggares cote was that barne borne,
But in a burgeys place of Bethlem the best (xii. 146-8)

is not clear. The sustained reference (pp. 177 ff.) to *Anima* as personified in *Passus XV* of the poem as feminine is inaccurate. It is clear that in this *Passus* the poet regards *Anima* as masculine. ('I coniured hym atte laste', xv. 14; "'3e, syre," I scyde', xv. 47.)

There is some valuable interpretation of points of detail. For example, in the discussion of the wedding of Meed, the comment on Civil and Simony makes clear the fundamental distinction between them and explains their differing attitudes to Theology (pp. 56 f.).

In conclusion, it may be said that the book provides a scholarly and illuminating study of the methods of medieval exegesis and an interpretation of *Piers Plowman* which must force the reader to reconsider carefully his own opinion of the poem's meaning. Whether one entirely agrees with the authors' arguments or not, one cannot afford to disregard them.

STELLA BROOK

The Lost Literature of Medieval England. By R. M. WILSON. Pp. xiv + 272.

London: Methuen, 1952. 15s.

Our learned disquisitions on the past, whether it be its architecture, its sculpture, its painting, or its literature, must inevitably be based on what remains to us today, but we are in danger of drawing false conclusions or presenting quite a wrong picture if we forget the fundamental fact that what remains is only a

part of what once existed. Now and then we are forcibly reminded of this by a few arches standing forlorn in a hummocky field, by a fragment of sculpture with traces of paint still preserved in its deeper recesses, by a St. Christopher or Christ of the Trades, all that remains of a once elaborate scheme of mural painting, in some remote country church, or by a few lines of verse obviously incomplete or by references to unknown stories now full of mystery to us. We do well to ponder such things; consider for a moment the circumstances under which two examples of our earlier literature have reached us. Of Anglo-Saxon epic poetry we have but a single specimen, *Beowulf*, and that survives in one manuscript which after weathering the vicissitudes of the Middle Ages nearly perished by fire as late as 1731, and the precious group of alliterative poems containing *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* and *Pearl* has been handed down to us likewise in a unique manuscript. If either manuscript had been lost how different would have been our accounts of Anglo-Saxon and Middle English poetry.

R. W. Chambers was the first to put in print some preliminary thoughts on this subject, but Mr. Wilson has made it very specially his own field of study, publishing the results of his researches in a number of papers over the past few years, and we must be grateful to him for gathering together and amplifying this material in the book now before us. The arrangement is excellent; it follows (with one exception) that adopted in the standard histories of Anglo-Saxon and Middle English literature—Heroic Legend, Historical Narrative, Christian Epic, Anglo-Saxon Prose, Saints' Lives, Romance, Short Narrative, Religious and Didactic Literature, Lyrical Poetry, Political and Satirical Poetry, and Drama—and this enables us to make an easy cross-check to the relevant sections in (say) Schofield's *English Literature from the Norman Conquest to Chaucer*. Two chapters essential to a complete study are wanting (as Mr. Wilson himself points out), namely, ones on Anglo-French and Anglo-Latin Literature, and let us hope that he will be able to print at some future date the material he has collected on these. Also, of course, the treatment is not exhaustive; that would have been impossible in a volume of this size and also, I think, needless, because individual problems can be followed up by those interested and the real value of this book is that it presents a comprehensive, well-ordered survey of the whole field.

The conclusions that emerge are interesting. There is no modification of the generally accepted views on heroic poetry, which has been studied by a succession of distinguished scholars such as Chambers and Chadwick, to mention no others, but there is evidence from the pre-Conquest period which seems to show that 'the place of the heroic poetry was gradually taken by subjects from later Anglo-Saxon history', and this is studied in the one chapter (Historical Narrative) that has no precise counterpart in the standard histories. The poems or sagas in which these subjects were treated (doubtless for the most part in the heroic manner) were almost certainly primarily current in oral circulation and never written down, and the evidence for their existence has to be sought therefore usually in summaries or references preserved by later writers. The neglect of this category in histories of our pre-Conquest literature is one example of the way in which that history has been slightly distorted. Another example is the corresponding over-attention devoted to the religious epic, which now bulks so largely in our

view today by the mere accident of the preservation of three great manuscripts of it; Mr. Wilson is surely right in seeing in it the ecclesiastics' attempt to substitute 'religious subjects for the suspect heroic or historical narrative'. It certainly seems to have exerted little influence on later literature, where its place was taken by the great corpus of vernacular saints' lives, which were 'popular', having nothing of the 'heroic' manner; and at this point I would invite particular attention to Mr. Wilson's comment that 'side by side with the written lives of the saints there existed a flourishing oral literature, *centred more particularly in the persons of the native saints*—a literature which was in fact simply a special branch of historical narrative'. (The italics are mine.) In other words the stories were in origin *local* and doubtless those relating to the lesser native saints remained so for the most part, as appears from several passages in a writer as late as Leland. Not enough attention has hitherto been devoted to this aspect of the literary output of the earlier Middle Ages. In fact, it would be interesting to see the material of the chapters on Historical Narrative and Saints' Lives represented on a sketch-map to show the way in which so much of this material bears the stamp of its original locality. Of the three Matters of Romance—Jean Bodel's 'trois matières . . . De France et de Bretagne et de Rome la grant'—probably little has been lost, but of the 'Matter of England' and of the large group dealt with under the title Short Narrative (that is, fabliaux, beast stories, the debate, the Robin Hood stories, and so on), a group that would have been primarily oral, the losses must have been considerable. By the very nature of the predominating cast of thought in the Middle Ages this is true too of the *secular* lyric, but references now collected in what is one of the most absorbing chapters in the book show the lyric to have been well established in England as early as the first half of the twelfth century. Another category of poetry that remains for the most part in fragmentary state is naturally that of political and satirical kind. The evidence relating to the drama, though extremely interesting, is perhaps the least rewarding from the point of view of 'lost' productions, except that the possibility that a secular drama may have existed is suggested by the survival of some fragments, such as part of a play on Robin Hood and the Sheriff of Nottingham (which may be compared with a reference in the Paston Letters).

It must have been no easy task to present so clearly the immense amount of evidence upon which this study is based; this evidence has been drawn from an extraordinarily wide range of material, which includes (besides the usual sources) wills and catalogues and inventories of books, two categories of documents which have now for the first time been exhaustively studied from the point of view of literary history. The conclusions are briefly stated for convenience in the final chapter, but they emerge clearly in the reading of the book itself and this fact alone is a tribute to the clarity of the work. Finally a word of praise is due for the very full and comprehensive general index (there is also an index of first lines).

C. E. WRIGHT

Secular Lyrics of the XIVth and XVth Centuries. Edited by ROSSELL HOPE ROBBINS. Pp. lv+331. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952. 18s. net.

This book fills excellently one of the most serious gaps in our knowledge of Middle English literature. Previously no adequate appreciation of the secular lyrical poetry had been possible; comparatively little of it was available in easily accessible editions, nor was it possible to say what proportion the printed lyrics bore to the whole of such extant literature. Now, for the first time, we have a complete collection of the minstrel verse, along with a representative selection from the more numerous courtly lyrics. The value of this anthology, based as it is on a wide and extensive knowledge of the manuscript material, is amply demonstrated by the fact that its 212 items include 57 poems not previously published, while others appear in the Introduction and in the Notes. Professor Robbins has divided the lyrics into Popular Songs, Practical Verse, Occasional Verse, and Courtly Love Lyrics, but, as he himself points out, the line of division, especially that between the first and the last of the sections, is not easy to draw, so that, for example, No. 38 seems rather to belong to the last section, Nos. 141, 149, 160 to the first.

To the modern reader the first two sections will prove by far the most attractive. The aureate diction of the courtly lyrics soon palls, and though some of the shorter ones are pleasant enough, e.g. 143, 147, 202, a little of the others goes a long way. Some of the occasional verse is attractive, e.g. the 'Monologue of a Drunkard' (117), 'The Blacksmiths' (118), 'The Hunted Hare' (119)—a surprising poem for the period—and the 'Epitaph for Rich. Alan' (124), but in general this verse has all the faults of the courtly lyrics with few of their virtues. The practical verse is particularly interesting from the point of view of social history. It includes charms, medical advice, gnomic verses, and versified weather prophecy. Little of it has any literary value, but its remarkable popularity during the medieval period necessitates the inclusion of a selection in any representative anthology. On the other hand there are few of the popular songs which do not immediately attract, and if particular mention is made of Nos. 20, 33, 48, that is only because they have not previously appeared in print.

The texts are followed by 64 pages of Notes into which the editor has succeeded in compressing a surprising amount of bibliographical, literary, and linguistic information. Occasionally a different interpretation suggests itself, e.g. *no more in can* (9/16) seems obviously to be for *no more i n(e) can*; *Verse le bauere* (10/5) is rather 'Pour out the drink'; *wel it slo* (80/6) 'will it slay (i.e. cure)'; *noght to leyn* (94/21) 'not to be concealed', &c.; but on the whole the Notes provide a good deal of badly needed help, and are certainly more than adequate. Unfortunately the same can hardly be said of the Glossary; it should surely be etymological, and it is a good deal too select. Presumably Professor Robbins has not realized how difficult some of the lyrics may appear to readers who do not possess his own intimate knowledge of them. But the Introduction, another masterpiece of compression, contains more than might have been expected. After classifying the manuscripts Robbins goes on to discuss the metrical forms. In general these are simple—couplets, quatrains, tail-rhyme, rhyme-royal, and ballade stanza—and

it is clear that earlier scholars have overstressed the 'variety of experimentation' appearing in the Middle English lyrical metres. Particularly noteworthy is the conclusion that French influence on the fourteenth- and fifteenth-century lyrics was comparatively slight, previous ideas of its importance being due to an exaggerated dependence on Harley 2253. But between 1300 and the Black Death practically no courtly secular poetry has survived, and little French influence is perceptible in the big collections of the fourteenth century, any unusual stylistic devices being more easily traced to the Latin rhetoricians. Particularly tantalizing are some of the fragments quoted here; the couplet from the *Fasciculus Morum*—presumably from some lost 'seduction' carole, the two lines of the 'worthless' dance-song which formed the text of a twelfth-century sermon, or the stanza of a lullaby which is preserved in a Latin sermon, and sounds remarkably unsuitable for a lullaby.

This is a fascinating collection which could have been compiled only by someone with Professor Robbins's exhaustive knowledge of the manuscript sources. The texts are excellent, the apparatus—apart from the glossary—is more than adequate, and the Introduction emphasizes some of the ways in which previous criticism of the secular lyrics will be changed by the appearance of what will certainly become the standard collection of them. It is good to know that the work of the late Professor Carleton Brown is being so ably carried on.

R. M. WILSON

Polydore Vergil, Renaissance Historian and Man of Letters. By DENYS HAY. Pp. xiii+223. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952. 25s. net.

Mr. Hay has recently added a third instalment to the Camden Society publications (now over a hundred years old) of the Tudor translation of Polydore Vergil's *Anglica Historia*. He now writes a book on this interesting figure: cleric, encyclopaedist, and historian, Collector of Peter's Pence in England in the reign of Henry VII, Archdeacon of Wells, and a man who kept the favour of four English rulers. Mr. Hay does not exaggerate the personal talent of his subject, admitting him to be 'only a little above the ordinary, both in his life and in his writings' (p. 173). But Polydore touched life at so many points, both on the Continent and in England, that he merits a monograph. Since his interest is more historical than literary, only a brief review is here appropriate.

Mr. Hay, in a book to which much labour has gone, gives chapters to Polydore's life, the minor works, the encyclopaedic work *De Inventoribus Rerum* (source of his great continental vogue), and (the two longest chapters) to the *Anglica Historia*. He has valuable appendixes comprising a list of letters to and from Polydore, variations in the versions of the *Anglica Historia*, and some important passages from the manuscript of the *Anglica Historia* in the Vatican. There is a last chapter of conclusions.

The chief interest of Polydore for the student of English is his colouring of the conception of history that enters into Elizabethan literature. But surely Mr. Hay exaggerates when he says, referring especially to Boswell-Stone's *Shakespeare's Holinshed* (1896), that 'this fact has scarcely been acknowledged by

students of Shakespeare'. Of his remarks on this theme those on Shakespeare's *Henry VIII* (pp. viii-ix) are the most novel and enlightening.

Mr. Hay's last chapter shows Polydore as something of a key figure in western civilization, or at any rate a man who, perhaps through his very mediocrity, was singularly representative. His *De Inventoribus Rerum* was transitional between the medieval and the neo-classic form of encyclopaedia.

Mr. Hay has written a needed if not especially enlivening book.

E. M. W. TILLYARD

The Tudor Books of Private Devotion. By HELEN C. WHITE. Pp. x+284. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1951. \$ 4.75.

The lines of approach to Tudor devotional literature followed in this book were laid down by Professor White in an essay published in *Joseph Quincy Adams: Memorial Studies* in 1948. The field of inquiry is now extended to include many more sixteenth-century books—psalters, primers, and less classic types of prayer-book and devotional manual—printed for the English market, and a more elaborate and detailed examination of the most interesting examples is undertaken. The shifting religious consciousness of the time which prepared for and witnessed the Reformation is traced, at a deeper and more intimate level than the public service-books represent, in the prefaces, interpretative headings, and comments, the selection and arrangement of contents, the modifications in traditional elements, and the careful phrasing of new prayers, to be seen in the collections made for private use.

We are accustomed, these days, to be told that continuity prevailed over change in the revolutionary century of Renaissance and Reformation. The interest of this book rests largely in what it reveals of the nature and causes of that continuity. The sixteenth-century compilers of prayer-books are still greatly indebted for much of form and content in their manuals to such great predecessors as Sts. Augustine, Bernard, Francis, Dominic, whose significant contributions to the evolution of Christian devotion Professor White summarizes lucidly and with some freshness, at the beginning of her study. This is in part, of course, a tribute to the success of the older books and to the clarity and balance of statement in the great prayers. But it is a conscious and deliberate traditionalism which inspires such prayers as those of Thomas Becon, mosaics of familiar, often scriptural, phrases, serving gently to introduce new modifications of thought and attitude. The same desire to disturb the lay mind no more than was necessary, together with the reluctance to sacrifice what was of proven worth, doubtless lay behind the survival of the *Fifteen Oes*, which represents the flowering of later medieval Passion devotion, in its imaginative and affective approach to the Crucifixion, yet is still to be found, surprisingly little modified, in Day's *Christian Prayers* of 1578. Indeed, this whole body of literature is marked by the keen awareness of the reading public which we associate with instruments of propaganda. It represents a deliberate effort, not always in the same direction, to make the laity conscious of critical issues, to foster the right

frame of mind to meet the challenge of the time ('the psychology of crisis' is Professor White's phrase), and to reconcile the inner life of the ordinary Christian with the advance in thought already being reflected in institutional changes. And here we touch a more fundamental tradition on which the final words of the 1948 essay were a comment: 'I am not sure but that the most important thing about this whole study is the contribution which it makes to our understanding of the enduring elements in religious thought and feeling.' For the Tudor books can be read as attempts to redress the balance of devotion in which thought, feeling, and imagination have each their proper part, helping the whole personality of man to keep pace with his new intellectual perceptions. Their business is still that of the older masters of prayer: to seek the perfect expression of what are thought at the time to be the finest and fittest of common human aspirations, and to guide those less expert than themselves in the devotional life, so that the Church, and the individuals of which it is composed, may suffer no loss of spiritual health through division, or inequality of talents and perception.

Professor White does not pretend to give a bibliographical survey of the devotional literature she is concerned with, but the information given in notes and select bibliography is not really adequate when one specific copy of an early printed book is under discussion (e.g. p. 87). A reference to the *Short-Title Catalogue*, or, at least, an indication of the library where the volume in question was consulted, would have made identification easier. The absence of any mention of the *S.T.C.* leads occasionally to further confusion. There is, for instance, a discrepancy between the date of the first edition of the Bull-Middleton *Christian Prayers and Holie Meditations* as given by Professor White (p. 182) and as stated in the *S.T.C.* Both authorities agree on the date of the third edition, and so a reader is left wondering whether Professor White is correcting the *S.T.C.* or whether a ghost has been created from the date of entry of the first edition in the Stationers' Register. Other mistakes occur: for instance, the 1564 edition of Part I of the *Worckes* of Thomas Becon is wrongly cited as *The Bokes, which Thomas Beacon hath made* (p. 254), and the statement is made (p. 42) that Whyte's Psalter [1550?] carries no indication of place of publication, although the correct 'London' is given in the bibliography (p. 254). There are a few misprints, e.g. 'New' for 'new' (p. 239), 'closed' for 'close' (p. 137), and we find Jerome of Ferrara, as Professor White usually calls him, once (p. 178) referred to as 'Hierom'. The chapter on 'The Medieval Inheritance' is marred by an over-emphatic style and excessive use of figurative language.

MARGERY M. MORGAN

Henry VI. Edited by JOHN DOVER WILSON. Part I, pp. lvi+222; Part II, pp. liv+221+folding table; Part III, pp. xlv+225. (The New Shakespeare.) Cambridge: University Press, 1952. Each 12s. 6d. net cloth; 21s. net leather.

These additions to the well-known New edition, by so eminent an authority, on what is perhaps the most involved and recalcitrant problem in the canon, are an event of the first importance in Shakespearian criticism, especially when taken

in conjunction with the editor's brilliant article on 'Malone and the Upstart Crow' (*Shakespeare Survey* 4). Professor Wilson is to be congratulated on putting all his cards on the table in a forthright case for revision, after handsomely conceding to the 'fundamentalists' many positions held by his predecessors. Since the qualities of editor and edition have long been adequately acknowledged, and space is strictly limited, it will not, I trust, be considered ungracious to concentrate on the main argument to the exclusion of much else.

Professor Wilson's motto is 'Back to Malone', but with a difference. Malone's arguments from the Quartos of Parts II and III (*The Contention and The True Tragedy*), so effectively disposed of by Professor Peter Alexander's *Shakespeare's 'Henry VI' and 'Richard III'*, are quietly relegated to limbo as so much 'rubbish', with the consequent abandonment of one of Malone's strongest positions—the Quarto-Folio variant passages in Part II. This admission, however, has the compensating merit of leaving Professor Wilson free to treat all three parts on the same footing, and argue his case from the Folio text alone.

Professor Wilson has retained, and indeed extended, Malone's other arguments from internal inconsistencies, the use of the chronicles, Greene's attack, parallels with Greene and Peele (and Nashe), inequalities of style, and knowledge of the classics. From these he deduces that Greene was the 'plotter' of all three parts, which he wrote originally with the collaboration of Nashe and, to some extent, of Peele. Parts II and III were written in 1591–2 for Pembroke's Men, and Shakespeare was later called in to revise. Part I followed. It is identified with Henslowe's 'Harey the vj' as a new play first performed by the combined Admiral-Strange company at the Rose on 3 March 1592, and was inspired partly by the success of Parts II and III, and partly by the topical bearing on Essex's Normandy expedition of 1591–2. The Admiral-Strange company broke with Greene after his double sale of *Orlando Furioso*, after which Shakespeare (as the previous reviser of II and III, though for a different company) was asked to shape the unfinished 'book' for a production at the earliest possible moment, perhaps with the help of Nashe. For his reward, Shakespeare brought back with him, for his own company, the playing rights of Part I! Hence its appearance in the Folio. It may be observed in passing that Professor Wilson's insistence on the structural qualities of the trilogy—developed in the admirable Introduction to Part III—seems a little inconsistent with this piecemeal provenance of the copy, and with what can be ascertained, from Greene's acknowledged work, of his 'plotting' abilities.

Professor Wilson's most convincing demonstration is that Greene's attack on the 'upstart crow' contains an implication of plagiarism. Conviction, however, does not necessarily extend to the intention of the attack, which was directed primarily against the actor, or to the application of the plagiarism to *Henry VI* in particular. Nor does the demonstration explain why 'our feathers' fails to include Marlowe with the other three. The argument, as it is developed for Nashe and Greene, was made on precisely the same basis for Marlowe by Tucker Brooke (*Trans. Conn. Acad.*, 1912), and one feels that the present case would have been strengthened by some explicit justification for the discrimination. Again, the Nashe and Greene parallels quoted are mainly proverbial, from well-known

sources, or could be echoed from one author to another; they do not carry the compulsion of revision as the only explanation, even when taken collectively.

So with the 'contrast between erudition [Greene, Nashe, Peele] and sheer ignorance [Shakespeare]'. McKerrow's *Nashe*, vol. iv, disposes of the underlying assumption. There Nashe is convicted of frequent recourse to English translations of the classics, and of numerous classical errors, e.g. the double error in the reference to Io (for Europa) at p. 18.

Professor Wilson has extended and varied Malone's argument from the use of different chronicles. He finds, for example, that Hall was the main source of Part III. On the other hand, Grafton (rather than Hall) was the main source of Part II, chiefly on the strength of the collocation of 'loved of the commons' with 'the good Duke of Gloucester'. Professor Wilson therefore regards it as likely that the miracle of St. Albans, II. i ('by Greene, perhaps slightly touched up by Shakespeare'), and I. i. 1-129 ('by Nashe'), are from Grafton; and 'since there is nothing elsewhere in Part II which can be traced to any passage in Hall that Grafton omitted in his transcription, there is no necessity to suppose that Hall was used at all'. But Foxe, as well as Grafton and More, gives the miracle as nearly verbatim as makes no difference, and along with it the collocation of 'commons' with 'the good Duke'; and, even more significant, Foxe alone has the Folio spelling *Hume*, which Professor Wilson has abandoned in favour of Grafton's *Hum*. The borrowings from Grafton are, in fact, equally attributable to Hall, or Foxe. The decisive passage, however, is the genealogy in II. ii, where Part II follows Hall exclusively in at least three readings—'in captivity' (1809 ed., p. 23); 'after Edward the third's death' (p. 2); and 'Edmund, Anne, and Elianor' (p. 2). It would therefore seem that Professor Wilson's argument might have to be reversed, to the effect that there is no necessity to suppose that *Grafton* was used at all; and that there is no variation in the use of the chronicles, Hall being in fact the main source of all three Parts.

Historical inconsistencies, again, of which there are many in *Henry VI*, may be accounted for on other hypotheses than revision. They arise naturally from the genealogical intricacies of the period—the author(s) had to work without Professor Wilson's admirable table—from the haste or ignorance of the playwright, his use of various chronicles simultaneously, the contradictions of the chronicles themselves, or from the technique of telescoping events in the interests of dramatic unity. To take only two of Professor Wilson's examples:—in Part I the loss of Paris is anticipated at I. i. 65, for its cumulative effect (with *Job* in the background)—a local dramatic purpose which does not, on the stage, conflict with its later presentation as being still in English hands; and, in Parts II and III, of the two versions of Clifford's death—both, incidentally, derived from Hall—one offers a casual reference to his death in battle (Hall 233), while the other is a major dramatic development of a revenge theme suggested by Hall's 'the lord Clifford marked him and sayde: by Gods blode, thy father slew myne' (251).

Professor Wilson is a master of the use of persuasive and defensive argument. He knows that 'verbal parallels afford by themselves inconclusive evidence of authorship', and that 'matters of style' are notoriously insecure ground to build

on. Yet it is on this and similar grounds that he is forced to found his case.¹ His Notes are thus rather those of an advocate than of an analyst, and are devoted to supporting the main hypothesis, somewhat at the expense of attention to dramatic effect, points of character, stagecraft, and imagery. In short, while one may feel that he has here put forward the argument for revision in its final form, with great courage, and masterly felicity of style and exposition, and has suggested new avenues of approach to an old subject, one is driven to admit that the verdict is still 'Not proven'.

ANDREW S. CAIRNCROSS

The Sources of *Much Ado About Nothing*: A Critical Study, together with the Text of Peter Beverley's *Ariodanto and Ieuneura*. By CHARLES T. PROUTY. Pp. vii+142. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1951. \$2.50; 16s. net.

Professor Prouty here applies himself to the problem of defining Shakespeare's method in the 'creative reinterpretation of his sources'. He has chosen a play in which the source-problem is fairly complex; and he shows that he is aware that this complexity may in itself be a valuable aid to interpretation. This makes his book important at a time when the study of sources rarely goes very deep. It cannot, however, be said that it is an exciting book, for it is written without much distinction, and some of its arguments will probably fail to satisfy many readers.

The Hero plot exists in many forms, and Mr. Prouty argues that a study of the earlier variants 'in relation to their own intellectual and literary milieu' will enable us to view the material more as Shakespeare saw it, and to understand better such problems as the character of Claudio and the relevance of the Beatrice story to the main plot. The author lists and surveys the known versions, but concentrates upon the non-dramatic versions stemming from Ariosto. In imitating the story, successive writers, in accordance with the contemporary doctrine of imitation, reinterpreted it; in a changing world, this meant an increasing emphasis on the love-story and its details, together with a tendency to modify the tale in accordance with altered fashions in love.

There is much in the analysis of Shakespeare's imitation that deserves applause; for example, the author is clearly right in his suggestion that the Don John plot, with the necessary addition of the Dogberry plot, was made necessary by Shakespeare's deliberate rejection, after *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, of the love-and-friendship motive as a dramatic theme. Dramaturgical considerations never, after the earliest days, control ideas. Further, there is value in the demonstration that *Much Ado* is interested in sexual love in a non-romantic way; though it is doubtful whether the rejection of artificial and literary modes of love is as simple as Mr. Prouty suggests. (It is far from simple in *As You Like It*, or in the other mature comedies.) But can this interest, and the changes it has wrought in the story, be explained as determined by a changed 'milieu'? Mr. Prouty clearly regards the new emphasis of the Hero story as being caused

¹ See, for example, the significant passages at Part I, pp. xlii-xlv, and Part II, pp. xiii-xv.

by a revulsion from Petrarchan formulae; Hero's marriage is arranged, and that of Beatrice is plainly anti-Petrarchan. The 'jargon and clichés' of romantic love were perhaps more enduring than the author pretends—nor is the dramatic presentation of Cupid confined to the 1580s and earlier, as he says. But the main difficulty is that in dealing with the changing milieu Mr. Prouty, as he admits at the end of his third chapter, is drawing upon the works he is discussing for evidence. The treatment of the plot changed because of certain changes in the milieu; these changes may be inferred from the treatment of the plot. A circular argument. In a note on p. 53 we are told that 'the nature of love behavior patterns' is a subject 'needing thorough study'. Exactly; such study must precede the confident exposition of this kind of thesis. In the meantime, more could perhaps be made of the point that the dramatist himself has discovered how to develop his themes suggestively in a dramatic context. It would be a pity if a revived interest in sources were to be stultified by what might be called climatic determinism.

One of Mr. Prouty's earlier versions is Peter Beverley's *Ariodanto and Leuneura* (c. 1566), a work to which he himself first drew attention some years ago. The unique Huntington copy of Beverley's poem is here carefully reprinted. Beverley's 2,800 fourteeners are dreary without being unreadable, if one keeps at it, and Mr. Prouty has adorned them with bibliographical and biographical notes.

FRANK KERMODE

Shakespeare Survey 5. Edited by ALLARDYCE NICOLL. Pp. viii+163. Cambridge: University Press, 1952. 15s. net.

Shakespeare Survey continues to discharge the duties it assumed four years ago. It reviews a year of Shakespeare studies, reports Shakespearian activity in the world at large, offers its own miscellany of critical writing, and yet attempts, this year as formerly, to have a dominant theme.

The reviews of the year's work are as usual balanced and readable, though Mr. McManaway, after a good start on 'The Text', rather curiously treats the controversy about Hotson's *Shakespeare's Sonnets Dated*, which Clifford Leech dealt with earlier in the book.

One of the valuable annuals is the detailed survey of some of the professional productions. Richard David very properly assaults one of them on the ground that it impudently attempted to mask the essential dullness of Shakespeare's comedy with tedious tomfoolery. This practice is indeed becoming a serious menace. Mr. David might well have been equally severe on ignorant cutting; one cannot look for a convincing account of *The Merchant of Venice* in a production which omits the Laban debate.

The miscellaneous material includes an interesting paper on Shakespeare and Pushkin by Tatiana Wolff, a drawing by Vertue from (possibly his own) memory of the surprisingly grand original house in New Place, and another article on the Shakespeare collection of a great library—this time Trinity College, Cambridge. There are two articles on Imagery, by S. L. Bethell and R. A. Foakes. Both show concern at the unmethodical chaos of this field of inquiry, and each offers, the

one by example and the other by precept, the elements of a method. These papers require detailed discussion, and a judgement unsupported by argument is ungrateful, but I cannot see them inhibiting the current flow of turgid fantasias. Imagery is becoming a bore, as Character did before it. One awaits a new synthesis.

The main theme of this issue is Textual Studies. The obvious difficulty, that the lay reader will not find this very engaging, is overcome by the first article, which is a splendid essay by Peter Alexander on the modern editor's task. There follows an interesting and controversial set of proposals, by Georges Bonnard, for an annotated edition of the plays for continental readers; it would not lack an English public.

At this point the lay reader probably retires, and we go into committee with two fascinating but technical articles. Alice Walker's paper on the relationship between the 1622 Quarto and the Folio texts of *Othello* is a concentrated attack on the current assumption that they originate in independent manuscripts. F, she contends, was printed from a corrected copy of Q1, and Q1 shows signs of memorial contamination. The method and economy of this alarming and convincing paper are in themselves negative evidence of the fact that by comparison the interpretative criticism of Shakespeare is in its adolescence. Nevertheless, having read Miss Walker's demonstration of the dependence of F on Q1, one may turn back to Professor Alexander's paper, where there is a brilliant restoration of *Othello*, v. ii. 68-70 which assumes the independence of Q1 and F. Meanwhile, if we accept Miss Walker's view, we have to accept the fact that for *Othello* we have only a text in part based on a Bad Quarto.

This is a new kind of Bad Quarto: a very good one. Philip Edwards, in the other paper, has another candidate for this class. He believes that the *Pericles* Quarto is Bad in two degrees, the first two acts very Bad and the remainder the report of one who must be called a pirate of genius. The argument is complex; as one would expect, the bibliographical demonstration is more convincing than the argument from style. Mr. Edwards succeeds in making a case for two pirates to set against that for two authors. The first pirate was a member-mainer; the second a thief of mercy. Mr. Edwards has done a good turn for him.

FRANK KERMODE

The Whipper Pamphlets. Edited by A. DAVENPORT. Part I, pp. xii+66; Part II, pp. viii+64 (Liverpool Reprints 5, 6). Liverpool: University of Liverpool Press, 1951. 5s. net each.

Mr. Davenport has done a service to students of early seventeenth-century literature in reprinting the three Whipper Pamphlets together from photostats of the copies in the Huntington Library. As he notes, Nicholas Breton's *No Whippinge* was reprinted (from the copy now in the British Museum, which, however, now lacks sigs. D5^r-D8^v) by Charles Edmonds as no. 3 of the Isham Reprints in 1895; but this is the first time that W.I.'s *The Whippinge of the Satyre* and *The Whipper of the Satyre his Pennance* have been reprinted. The copy of *The Whippinge* in the Bodleian Library would appear to offer no variant readings,

but the B.M. copy of *The Whipper* has the full stop at l. 12 with which Mr. Davenport emends his text, reads 'some' for 'shune' in l. 102:

Who seekes the one? or who doth shun the other?
So much is man to some a sinfull brother.

(ll. 101-2)

and 'then' for 'them' in l. 106:

They may command as God commandeth then
But we will do our willes: Why? we are men.

(ll. 106-7)

In his Introduction Mr. Davenport summarizes the evidence collected in his article, 'The Quarrel of the Satirists',¹ for identifying 'W.I.', the author of *The Whipping*, with John Weever, and the *Satirist*, *Epigrammatist*, and *Humorist* attacked in the poem with John Marston, Edward Guilpin, and Ben Jonson respectively; and finally, for attributing the anonymous *The Whipping* to Edward Guilpin. In the case of *The Whipping* it does seem to have been especially necessary to recapitulate the reasons for supposing Weever to be the author, as Grosart's ascription of the satire to William Ingram is accepted without discussion in Mr. J. B. Leishman's recent edition of *The Three Parnassus Plays*.² One of the obstacles to the attribution to John Weever, and an argument used in support of William Ingram, is the punning on the name 'Will' in *The Whipping*, which of course, replies to *The Whipping*:

Had I a Child (though bearing name of Will)
He should not tie that Will vnto himselfe:
Selfe-will is nought, tis bad, tis passing ill,
Should Will in that will ioy, I'de ierke the elfe:

(ii. 42, ll. 67-70)

Commenting on these lines, Mr. Davenport says (ii. 56): 'This appears to be a pointed allusion to the name "William"; but it is probably in fact merely a use of the name for the sake of the pun . . .'; and in i. viii he declares that 'the allusion to "Will" is not at all clear'. It seems fairly clear to me, and I suggest that the explanation is that Guilpin did not know who the author of *The Whipping* was. He addresses him as 'thou (vaine glorious) who so e're thou art' (ii. 40, l. 25), and further declares 'But what, where, when, or who, I care not' (ii. 45, l. 145). Guilpin turns his attention to the 'proud aspiring insolent':

And thus I argue, holding argument
Against the proud aspiring insolent
Apparrelld in an imbray vestament,
As if within obliuious continent:
But such a hissing Serpent can not lie
Vnder the shadow of obscuritie.

(ii. 40, ll. 37-42)

Mr. Davenport explains 'imbray vestament' as 'concealed behind the curtain of an aumbry', and comments 'It is an odd image, and there may be some special significance which I cannot explain' (ii. 56). Might not Guilpin here be attacking

¹ *M.L.R.* xxxvii (1942), 123-30.

² London, 1949; p. 91.

Hall, whose henchman he must have realized 'W.I.' was? Hall was ordained at Colchester on 14 December 1600, and was offered the rectory of Hawstead some time in 1601, though admittedly he did not take up his duties there until 2 December 1601, a month after *The Whipper* was entered in the Stationers' Register.¹

As has been indicated, the editor has provided some useful and stimulating notes to the Whipper Pamphlets. It does not, however, seem necessary to suggest the emendation 'exprobie' for 'experience' in l. 847 of *The Whipping*:

Experience, the looking-glasse of fooles,
Shewes much contention, little good affords,

This is surely a variant of the proverb 'Experience is the mistress of (or teaches) fools' (*O.D.E.P.*, 2nd ed., p. 182). The next line speaks of learning in the grammar schools. Nor do I see the necessity for scanning l. 243

1 5 9 & 9.

as a line of four feet, 'Fifteen hundred ninety and nine', when the common style, 'One thousand five hundred ninety and nine', gives five feet.

Subscribers to the series will welcome the additional notes to earlier numbers (iii. 62-63); though such additions do tend to get overlooked when tucked away at the end of a later volume.

JEAN ROBERTSON

A Midnight's Trance. By WILLIAM DRUMMOND. Edited from the edition of 1619 by R. ELLRODT. Pp. xxix+35 (Luttrel Society Reprints, 10). Oxford: Basil Blackwell, for the Society, 1951. No price given.

A Midnight's Trance is an early version of Drummond's prose meditation *A Cypress Grove* (1623), published in 1619, and here reprinted for the first time from the unique copy recently discovered in the Bodleian Library. In an admirable Introduction, Mr. Ellrodt argues convincingly for ascribing the composition of the work to the years 1612-14. A statement on the title-page records that it was 'Written at the desire of a Nobleman', and Mr. Ellrodt seems to me to be right in questioning whether the author had any stronger inner compulsion to the work than this. There is a certain impersonality about it that distinguishes it from a work like Donne's *Devotions*, for example, which bears so strong an impress of the writer's personality and experience. One may well believe that the latter was the expression of a 'betossed soul's' experience in sickness, but neither *A Midnight's Trance* nor *A Cypress Grove* suggests very strongly that Drummond's meditation was occasioned by any immediate personal suffering. Bishop Sage's assertion that the latter was the product of Drummond's dangerous illness in 1620 is, of course, disproved by the discovery of the existence of *A Midnight's Trance*.

The main interest of *A Midnight's Trance* naturally lies in the comparisons to be made between it and *A Cypress Grove*. Most surprising perhaps is the unimportance of the changes made. The revised version is substantially the same work. The eight or nine years that had intervened had brought Drummond at least one great sorrow in the death of his intended bride, yet there is no hint of

¹ *The Collected Poems of Joseph Hall*, ed. A. Davenport (Liverpool, 1949), p. xviii.

this in his meditation; his vision of 'Death, the nature of Soules, and estate of Immortalitie' still remains detached and philosophic. The numerous small changes that he has made are the work of the fastidious stylist, not of the man of riper experience. Words and phrases are altered, simplicity giving way to a more august manner (e.g. 'ageworn stories', *M.T.*, p. 4, becomes 'fabulous Paladins'); passages that had been unduly compressed before are expanded, so as to make the argument easier to follow. The trend of development is like that in the three editions of Bacon's *Essays*: thoughts which in the earlier work had been set down 'rather significantly than curiously' are enlarged, in the interests of clarity and of euphony.

A Midnight's Trance adds nothing fundamental to our knowledge of Drummond. What it does do is to show him confirmed at an early age in the practices that characterize his later work. We see him already established, for instance, in what Mr. Ellrodt wisely calls a *Christian Platonism*: those passages in which he discourses on the nature of the soul are surprisingly little altered in the later version. Again, the researches of earlier editors had already shown *A Cypress Grove* to be little more than a string of borrowings, and most of these borrowings, together with some omitted there, are to be found in the earlier work. One wonders why Drummond omitted from *A Cypress Grove* the long borrowings from Hamlet's famous soliloquy, while on the other hand enlarging his debt to Bacon's essay on Death. Was it perhaps that the former had become too familiar, too hackneyed? For one thing that the omissions and additions do reflect is the up-to-dateness of Drummond's interests. In *A Midnight's Trance* he had been content to echo Donne's *First Anniversary*; in *A Cypress Grove* he not merely echoes it, but shows an acquaintance with the new philosophy that was not apparent in the earlier work.

Mr. Ellrodt's researches have added to the list of Drummond's borrowings, while his comments on his style and subject are always illuminating. *A Cypress Grove* is *A Midnight's Trance* in state dress, and no doubt it is its decorative qualities that have won it a place in seventeenth-century prose alongside Browne's *Hydriotaphia* and Taylor's *Holy Dying*; nevertheless, this homelier version has a charm of its own, if only for its comparative simplicity and intimacy of manner.

JOAN GRUNDY

Demetrius and Enanthe. By JOHN FLETCHER. Edited by MARGARET McLAREN COOK and F. P. WILSON. Pp. xiv+126 (The Malone Society Reprints). London: Oxford University Press, 1950 (1951). Subscribers only.

The Brogyntyn manuscript of *Demetrius and Enanthe* is the only signed dramatic manuscript of Ralph Crane. It was presented to Sir Kenelm Digby in 1625, and is now in the possession of Lord Harlech. Dyce's edition of 1830 freely altered spelling and punctuation. Now in this Malone Society Reprint we have a trustworthy edition of one of Fletcher's most interesting plays, in a form generally superior to the Folio version.

The introduction supplements the account of Crane's scribal habits given in the Malone Society Reprint of *The Witch*. The combined question-mark and

comma, used three times in *The Witch*, is more frequent here; hyphenation is less frequent, but the editors tell us that this is the only dramatic manuscript in which Crane uses the double hyphen within the line; there is a free use of the apostrophe to indicate elision or, occasionally, slurring. One may note 'noe 'beleeve' Sir' (l. 472), where the first apostrophe suggests a monosyllabic pronunciation for 'beleeve': at l. 1688 the same phrase appears as 'no (beleeue' (Sir)', where the first bracket is probably a scribal slip. The editors record a number of characteristic Crane spellings, some of them already found in *The Witch*.

The relation between the manuscript and the Folio text is not discussed. R. Warwick Bond in the Variorum edition (1905) cited manuscript readings from Dyce, and A. R. Waller in the Cambridge edition (1906) examined the manuscript afresh and, not altogether accurately, recorded in an appendix manuscript variants and passages not found in the Folio. Yet E. H. C. Oliphant, in *The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher: An Attempt to determine their Respective Shares and the Shares of Others* (1927), could say that the manuscript gives 'a much fuller text' and that the Folio version was 'obviously abridged for acting'. Actually the manuscript has some seventy lines not in the Folio, which, however, is the sole authority for some twenty lines of dialogue and for the two songs (32 lines) in iv. iii. Even in the Folio the text is only some 270 lines shorter than *Hamlet*.

Apart from the songs, the passages omitted by Crane nowhere extend to more than four consecutive lines, and may have been dropped accidentally. The songs may be a later addition, as the manuscript stage-direction in iv. iii suggests only music and dance. It was noted by Professor F. P. Wilson¹ that the manuscript frequently uses milder forms of expletive (as in l. 1287, where 'beshrew thy hart' appears for 'Curse o' my life'), but that such changes are not consistently made: in l. 2845, for example, the manuscript boldly has 'by heaven' where the Folio is content with a dash after 'by'. As Crane was himself an author, the dilutions were perhaps his. At one point there is a difference between the texts in act-division: the last two scenes of the Folio's Act IV become in the manuscript the first two scenes of Act V, thus making the last act nearly a fifth instead of approximately a ninth of the whole play. The manuscript division is preferable, as the Folio's iv. vii introduces the last movement of the plot, in which Demetrius becomes suspicious of Enanthe's virtue. The Hostess of the manuscript is called 'Governess' in the Folio, which is clearly erroneous. Finally, the Folio calls the play *The Humorous Lieutenant*: the action involving the Lieutenant is mere sub-plot, but the title doubtless indicates its popularity. We can, I think, assume that the Folio version is nearer to the acted play, but it may include matter that was omitted in performance. When the play is reprinted in a text for general use, Crane's manuscript should, apart from its bowdlerizings, provide the 'copy'.

The present reprint should increase the attention given to this engaging blend of military operatics and court intrigue. As plainly as anything by Fletcher, it shows the growing preoccupation with love and honour, and the scenes with Enanthe are vivacious and observant. The Lieutenant is a little trying in print,

¹ *The Library*, vii (Sept. 1926), 194-215.

especially when he mistakenly drinks a love-potion and grows amorous of the King: this, however, strengthens the case for reverting to what was surely the play's original name.

CLIFFORD LEECH

The Prayers of John Donne. Selected and edited by HERBERT H. UMBACH. Pp. 109. New York: Bookman Associates, 1951. \$ 2.50.

This is an interesting book, well arranged and produced. Professor Umbach has collected a number of prayers from the *Essays in Divinity*, *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions*, *Letters*, and *Sermons*, and has added to them certain of the *Divine Poems*, so as to give the reader a wide selection of Donne's prayers in prose and verse. He has supplied an introduction on Donne's idea of prayer, which contains an anthology of passages in which Donne discusses the theory and practice of Christian prayer.

The selection of prayers is open to some criticism. Most of those taken from the *Letters* are mere scraps, too conventional in tone to be of any value. It would have been better to have omitted this section altogether, and to have allotted the space to some additional prayers from the *Sermons*. It was a mistake to exclude the fine prayer which closes the sermon on Proverbs viii. 17, 'I love them that love me, and they that seek me early shall find me':

O glorious beauty, infinitely reverend, infinitely fresh and young, we come late to thy love, if we consider the past daies of our lives, but early if thou beest pleased to reckon with us from this houre of the shining of thy grace upon us; and therefore O God, as thou hast brought us safely to the beginning of this day, as thou hast not given us over to a finall perishing in the works of night and darkness, as thou hast brought us to the beginning of this day of grace, so defend us in the same with thy mighty power, and grant that this day, this day of thy visitation, we fall into no sin, neither run into any kind of danger, no such sinne, no such danger as may separate us from thee, or frustrate us of our hopes in that eternall kingdom which thy Sonne our Saviour Christ Jesus hath purchased for us, with the inestimable price of his incorruptible blood.¹

The introductory essay is so full of interesting quotations from Donne that it seems ungrateful to complain, and yet the reader feels that something more explanatory and also more critical is needed to supplement it. Professor Umbach says nothing of Donne's debt to his predecessors, or of the use which he made of the liturgy of the Church. In the passage quoted above the first sentence is translated from St. Augustine, and the later sentences are an expansion of the third collect for Morning Prayer in the Book of Common Prayer. The finest of Donne's prayers are the fruit of a long and rich tradition of Christian worship. Some hint of this indebtedness might have been given in the notes at the end of the book. Moreover, many of the prayers suffer from being detached from their context. They are the result of prolonged meditation on some passage of Scripture, and the preceding pages are necessary if we are to grasp their full meaning. This is particularly true of the prayers taken from the *Essays in Divinity*. One

¹ XXVI *Sermons*, XVIII, p. 269.

prayer of which Professor Umbach says on page 104: 'Its learned style is more for display than devotion' is in fact a very careful summary of the spiritual lessons to be learned from the long discussions on the Creation and the Name of God which had preceded it. Similarly the third prayer taken from the *Essays* sums up Donne's meditations on the spiritual meaning of the Book of Exodus. If, however, this book sends its readers to consult Donne's *Sermons*, *Essays*, and *Devotions*, it will have done good service.

E. M. SIMPSON

The Tragedy of Hoffman. By HENRY CHETTLE. 1631. Prepared for the Malone Society by HAROLD JENKINS. Pp. xxxii + [80]. Oxford: University Press (for the Malone Society), 1950 (1951).

The 1631 quarto of Chettle's *Hoffman* 'is vilely printed. It is on poor paper, so that type often shows through. . . . There is also a good deal of smudging. The type was badly worn, with many broken letters.' Everyone with occasion to read the play has good reason to be grateful for this reprint which maintains, on the part of all concerned, the very high quality of workmanship associated with the Malone Society.

Twenty-five copies of the 1631 quarto are known: twelve have been collated for the purposes of this reprint; ten (including one Folger copy in photostats) by Dr. Jenkins and three (the three Folger copies) by Dr. Charlton Hinman. Five variant versions of the Dedication are known and eight variant formes (affecting the readings of six sheets) are exemplified in the text of the twelve copies collated. The reprint reproduces a hypothetical ideal copy (not encountered among those collated) with all known variant formes in the corrected state. As Dr. Jenkins reminds us, the proof-reader's corrections may sometimes have carried us further from the manuscript and they have clearly sometimes resulted in miscorrection and type dislocation of a trivial kind. This cannot be helped. Any picking and choosing among the variants or interpretation of the printer's intentions would have resulted in an edited text (which this is not), and what was lost in the process of proof correction is evident, in any case, from Dr. Jenkins's list of variants in the different formes.

In five pages of austere introduction the reader is given a cogent account of what is known, or can safely be inferred, concerning the history of the play. Between Henslowe's advance of five shillings to Chettle in part-payment of 'a tragedie called Hawghman' in December 1602 and Hugh Perry's publication of the quarto in 1631 the only known reference to *Hoffman* is John Grove's registration of the copyright in February 1629/30 and, since Grove transferred the copyright to William Leake in 1637, Perry's standing in the 1631 publication is not clear. From the statement on the quarto's title-page that it had been 'divers times acted with great applause, at the Phenix in Druery-lane', it is evident that it belonged at this time to Queen Henrietta's Company, and Dr. Jenkins infers that it belonged originally to Worcester's.

The manuscript acquired by Perry was defective or illegible here and there throughout and also at the close, since the text breaks off (seemingly not far from

the en-
rently
attemp-
to Oth-
made
reader
presen-
clature
serious
guidan-
selecti-
readin-
with v
The
and P
like ey
able r
doubt
reprin-
of the
it is i
tiated

Geor-
By
III
Wh
contin-
a con-
tradit-
'ports
witho-
Th
Chap-
by th
some
indus-
tive.
obscu-
for C
the n
telling
eight

the end) with the unmasking of Hoffman's villainy. It had been copied (apparently by someone with no ear for metre) and also cut; and an unsystematic attempt had been made to alter the name of Hoffman's first victim from Charles to Otho. A text which represents what an inefficient seventeenth-century printer made of fouled manuscript of this kind is not, of course, easy reading, and the reader of this reprint has to apply himself strenuously to the editorial problems presented by its lacunae, defective metre, and inconsistencies in plot and nomenclature. I can make no more than Dr. Jenkins has done of the quarto's more serious textual cruxes and should indeed have been glad of more editorial guidance in the interpretation of some of its apparently less serious errors. The selectively annotated list of the three hundred odd 'irregular and doubtful readings' common to all the quartos collated leaves the reader many problems with which to grapple.

The text and textual apparatus seem to me scrupulously accurate. Dr. Jenkins and Professor Sisson (who checked the reprint) have scrutinized it with lynx-like eyes. The collation of quartos so abominably printed and so full of questionable readings, where the intention is often clear but the actual letter a matter of doubt, must have been a severe test of editorial patience and eyesight. The reprint should, of course, be read in conjunction with Dr. Jenkins's fuller account of the play's literary background and textual problems in his book on Chettle, and it is interesting to see how well the conclusions he reached in 1934 are substantiated by his subsequent work on the play.

ALICE WALKER

George Chapman (1559-1634): sa vie, sa poésie, son théâtre, sa pensée.

By JEAN JACQUOT. Pp. iv+311 (Annales de l'Université de Lyon, Lettres, III, 19). Paris: Société d'Édition *Les Belles Lettres*, 1951. Price not stated.

When F. L. Schoell published in 1926 a volume of *Études sur l'humanisme continental en Angleterre* devoted mainly to Chapman, Émile Legouis called for a consequent revaluation of Chapman's work. M. Jacquot continues the same tradition of French scholarship, and although he explicitly does not attempt the 'portrait d'ensemble' that Legouis desired, his survey of a subject that, even without the Homer, is still 'assez vaste' brings us somewhat nearer to it.

The first of the book's three sections usefully assembles the external facts of Chapman's life, though these now need supplementing for the Jacobean period by the discoveries of C. J. Sisson and Robert Butman.¹ M. Jacquot is able to add something on Chapman's early continental experiences and contacts. But the industry of his investigation is not accompanied by much care for coherent narrative. There is a disease of scholarship in which the intricacies of the evidence obscure the conclusions which should be drawn from it; and while the evidence for Chapman's residence at Oxford is no doubt inconclusive, M. Jacquot leaves the matter not just undecided but ambiguous (pp. 9-10). When he should be telling us of Chapman's life in London and on the Continent in the five-eighties, he embroils us in the Chancery suit of twenty years ahead from which

¹ *M.L.R.* xlii (1951).

his information is derived. On the other hand, a reluctance to repeat familiar material may leave us with serious gaps. More space is given to the Overbury murder than to all Chapman's formative period as a dramatist. Neither in the biographical section nor in the chapters on the plays is there a complete chronological survey of Chapman's dramatic authorship, and no more than a perfunctory gesture is made towards the theatres and companies for which Chapman wrote.

The limitation which this suggests in M. Jacquot's interest in his author continues to be shown in the second section, on the works, where, apart from some insistence on Chapman's links with Marlowe, there is only a superficial attempt to relate the plays to the dramatic traditions of the period. For purely dramatic criticism one would still do better to go to Parrott's introductions to the plays. It is significant, too, that M. Jacquot relies on Parrott's arguments in the problems of the production of *Caesar and Pompey* and Shirley's connexion with *Chabot*. I suspect that he too readily accepts Mrs. N. D. Solve's interpretation of *Chabot* as a defence of the disgraced Earl of Somerset to be dated as late as 1621-3. There is no word anywhere of Chapman's probable collaboration in *The Bloody Brother*.

In other respects, however, the individual works are well studied. A short essay on each outlines the action, investigates the source, explains the nature of Chapman's interest in the material, and relates this to his dominant ideas, which are shown as the inspiration of a powerful poetic imagery. Good use is made of Schoell's researches, and M. Jacquot's own extend our knowledge of Chapman's reading in some important particulars. He defines further the debt to Ficino and the *Hermetica*, exhibiting, for example, Chapman's use of Ficino's Latin translation of the *Poimandres*, especially in *The Tears of Peace*. This poem is shown to derive from Paynell's translation of Erasmus's *The Complaint of Peace*; the allegory of *Eugenia* is traced to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Chapman's work upon the Homer is considered to have influenced *The Tragedy of Byron*. His reading in the philosophers is used to exhibit his preoccupation with those subjects which keep recurring in his works—man's relation to the universe and 'la lutte de l'esprit contre les servitudes de la matière'. It is here that M. Jacquot makes his largest contribution to the 'portrait d'ensemble'; for he connects Chapman's changing views upon these philosophic problems with the evolution of a coherent personality. Chapman's ideal is seen to swing from Bussy, who seeks to impose his will upon circumstances, to Clermont and Cato, who achieve mastery over circumstances by submitting themselves to the universal will. The alternation of a contempt for this world with a delight in it as the image of a more perfect one appears as the expression of a permanent conflict in the poet's mind.

Going farther, M. Jacquot's third section, on Chapman's thought, seeks the origin of this mental drama in Platonism, and explains its progress as the modification of Platonism by a fusion of Stoic and Christian doctrine. But this valiant attempt at a synthesis reflects both the strength and the weakness of the book. For M. Jacquot 'il s'agissait avant tout de préciser le message que Chapman avait tenté de transmettre'. By his careful examination of Chapman's ideas he has done much to illumine the plays and poems. But he has a little too much regarded Chapman as if a poet-dramatist who found his loftiest inspiration in a

passion
a 'syst

Relig
Mi

Lar

Cop

195

Th

and c

Midd

chara

of the

mater

ism,

and v

intro

regar

quar

more

in su

mine

chief

A

a for

a bac

in th

come

sum

flat

seco

intru

for r

apoc

us m

or g

a ca

poir

cap

play

Dev

T

for

edit

passion for metaphysical truth were a philosopher intent upon the elaboration of a 'système'.

HAROLD JENKINS

Religion and Superstition in the Plays of Ben Jonson and Thomas Middleton. By BERTIL JOHANSSON. Pp. 339 (Essays and Studies on English Language and Literature, VII). Upsala: A. B. Lundeqvistska Bokhandeln; Copenhagen: Munksgaard; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950. Sw. Kr. 9.50; 12s. net.

This attempt, by a Swedish scholar, 'to show how the problems of religion and of its caricature, superstition, are reflected in the plays of Jonson and Middleton', brings together and provides useful comments upon most of the characters, situations, and references in the plays generally accepted as the work of these two Jacobean dramatists and proves—if proof were needed—what rich materials their active, satirical interests found in religion and especially Puritanism, in astrology and alchemy and in the more blatant superstitions of magic and witchcraft. There is, it is true, a piece of dubious logic in the argument introducing the two sciences which were, as Mr. Johansson recognized, not regarded as superstitions in that period, but there is no purpose served by quarrelling with their inclusion and probably it is the somewhat clumsy phrasing more than the reasoning that is at fault. It is useful to have them dealt with in such a study, and although he admits to being unable now and then to determine the degree of credence given them by his playwrights he wisely depends chiefly on their palpable detestation of fraudulent practices.

A minor discomfort, and one to which such an investigation conducted by a foreign scholar using a language not his own is prone, is in the presentation of a background to his special concern, as, for instance, in the attempt to sketch in the course of the Reformation in England or to reconstitute what has recently come to be known as the 'Elizabethan world-picture'. Much which will presumably be most useful for Swedish students if they read English fluently is flat for English readers since it is necessarily derivative, though from sound secondary sources, and subject to a blurring of focus, as details are suddenly intruded upon a general statement. It seems odd, for instance, to give as evidence for the career of Thomas Cromwell a reference to a play in the Shakespeare apocrypha. Many pages, however, contain information from which most of us may quietly profit, suppressing the feeling that what is provided is elementary or gratuitous: the explanation of a number of alchemical concepts and terms is a case in point. While most of the information is sound, here and there a minor point invites correction: a corner-cap is, of course, not a 'mitre' but an academic cap of three or four corners. The red-haired Judas would not be seen in Morality plays but in the Mysteries. The facsimile of a Swedish student's pact with the Devil, though a little beyond the Jacobean period, will be new to English readers.

The bibliography and a few footnotes reveal that it has not always been easy for Mr. Johansson to come by the latest books on his subject. R. C. Bald's edition of *A Game At Chess* came to him late, he did not have the advantage of

the last two volumes of Dr. Simpson's *Jonson*, he has depended upon Collier's transcripts of Henslowe's Diary and, as it seems, never enjoyed the use of Sir Walter Greg's work on this maddening document. But the authorities cited are good ones, and only a few are out of date; what they have to offer is sensibly applied and the quotations and references, as far as they have been checked, are accurate. A slip on p. 239 is a small exception (in note 3, for II. 289 read V. 186) and might hold up someone else as it did the reviewer, especially as De Winter's edition of *The Staple of News* repeats Gifford-Cunningham's original slip of John 'Geb' for John Gee.

The very miscellaneous matter is loosely organized under fairly obvious headings and the text is heavy with footnotes where occasionally an 'however' betrays an irrelevant expansiveness (pp. 89, 131). In the conclusion nothing is, strictly speaking, concluded but the findings are briefly summarized.

Those who consult this book will respect in it such honest work as Jonson, if not Middleton, would have recognized although his own labours were directed to a creative, not often to a critical, end.

K. M. LEA

Jonson's *Masque of Gipsies* in the Burley, Belvoir, and Windsor Versions: An Attempt at Reconstruction. By W. W. GREG. Pp. x+235. London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, for the British Academy, 1952. 25s. net.

Hard on the heels of his two-text *Faustus* comes Sir Walter Greg's edition of the reconstructed texts of Jonson's *Masque of Gipsies* in parallel form: the basic text of the first performance on 3 August 1621 at Burley, with the Belvoir variants, set against the revised version for subsequent performance at Windsor early in September.

As materials there are four major texts, one in variant form. This latter is the 1641 duodecimo edition of the masque which in its pre-publication state (D_1) contained only the Burley text but which, when issued, had been revised by extensive cancellation (D_2) to introduce some of the major Windsor revisions. The cancellanda leaves of this book are known only in a unique copy in which four of the twelve are missing and need to be reconstructed. Then there are two manuscripts offering conflated versions of the whole text, Huntington Library (H) and Newcastle (N). Finally, the Jonson Folio version (F), posthumously printed. A scattering of subsidiary manuscripts of portions of the masque is of lesser importance.

On the basis of a rigorous examination of the texts, Sir Walter draws a tree by which D_1 descended from α , considered to be Jonson's original autograph of the Burley version; H from hypothetical MS. β , itself derived from α revised by the Belvoir and main Windsor revisions; the D_2 cancellanda leaves from hypothetical MS. γ , derived from further revised β ; and N and F radially from hypothetical MS. f , derived from further (and finally) revised γ . For the Burley version, therefore, D_1 is chosen as copy-text so far as the original text is preserved; and for the Windsor version, H, as the manuscript exhibiting the minimal degree of error for this form. Since the edition is a critical reconstruction of both versions,

errors in D_1 and in H are corrected by reference to other texts; and all authorial revisions present in D_2 and in NF, as they are critically separated from scribal variants, are inserted in the Windsor copy-text, H. In more than the usual sense these are reconstructed texts, since the avowed intent is—at least in essentials—not to reprint any single copy-text but rather to reconstruct the essentials of lost α for the Burley version, and then, for Windsor, those authentic revisions present successively in revised α' (from which descended β and H), β' (source of γ and D_2), and γ' (source of f and NF).

In this process Sir Walter is properly insistent that, except for the critically identifiable revisions, there are not two textual traditions represented by Burley and by Windsor, but only one (pp. 69–70, clarified materially on p. 78). Hence all substantive variants must be reduced to the category of authorial revisions or of scribal 'errors', for apart from revisions the two texts are each ultimately forms of α and must therefore coincide in the substantives of the unrevised portions. Much of his Introduction and series of appended textual notes is taken up with this delicate process of critical winnowing of the variants, even down to very minor forms of words which are not mere spelling doublets.

Here the difficult question of precisely what constitutes a variant is tackled from a new approach for Elizabethan texts. Most editors, following Sir Walter's own lead in his recent remarks on the rationale of copy-text, have worked with a distinction between the 'substantives', or meaningful verbals of a text, and the 'accidentals', or the clothing of spelling, capitalization, and punctuation which forms the texture for the 'substantives'. The 'accidentals', in theory, were to be governed by the copy-text selected; the 'substantives' by the critical judgement of the editor when more than one text with authority was present. For the purposes of establishing the genetic relationship of the main early versions of the *Masque*, Sir Walter has broadened the definition of 'substantives' to include any of the 'accidentals' which group themselves, as do the verbals, according to the genetic relationship of the authorities. These he has treated as critically as the substantives in the reconstruction of his parallel texts, and has thus gone farther than other editors of Elizabethan texts in substituting recovered authorial forms of 'accidentals' for the scribal or compositorial forms of the copy-text.

If this process could have been carried to its ultimate conclusion, there would have been no need for a two-text edition. But the majority of the 'accidentals' are not susceptible to this critical treatment, and though Sir Walter's stated reasons for the two-text form (p. 104, n. 1) are perhaps not of the strongest—especially since the punctuation of the Windsor text is his own—there is perhaps sufficient justification, as he asserts, for the interest inhering in the presentation of the text as it appeared on the one hand in the earliest printed edition, and on the other in a contemporary manuscript.¹ The choice of presentation in two

¹ In fact, by restricting himself to the materials present in the *Masque* texts, with only occasional support from other Jonson sources, Sir Walter has proceeded as far towards the reconstruction of α both in substantives and in accidentals as it is possible to go without introducing synthetic reconstruction from a close study of other Jonson texts and an importation from them of identifiable Jonsonian characteristics not revealed by the genetic groupings of the *Masque* variants. The interesting question of the validity of the synthetic approach is too complex to discuss here. What is important to point out is that Sir Walter

largely divergent textures is not illogical in comparison with the declared purpose to reconstruct basic α and its revisions in a single textual tradition when it is recognized that the reconstruction concerns itself chiefly with the 'substantives', and that of the 'accidentals' goes no farther than is justified by the evidence garnered from those capable of genetic grouping. For the remainder, which are in the majority, the divergent copy-texts hold sway.

The two texts are intended, therefore, to represent the actual words spoken and sung at Burley (and Belvoir) and at Windsor in the productions on these two occasions. In some few respects the Burley text is a temporal one as printed here and does not represent the final intentions of the author. The composite texts after D_1 give some very few readings in exclusively Burley material not repeated at Windsor which are more likely to represent casual authorial revision subsequent to Burley than scribal variation. Sir Walter excludes such readings from his text since they could not have been spoken at Burley, and they do not, of course, appear in his Windsor version, from which the composite material relating only to Burley (and Belvoir) has been removed. This is within an editor's discretion according to the particular critical text he is proposing to offer. Nevertheless, because of the importance of any authorial revision, whether prior or subsequent to a single selected performance, it may seem to be a mistake in judgement that such post-performance Burley revisions, like *heape* for *powe* made in *f* at B21, are not given a special place in the otherwise admirably contrived apparatus at the foot of the page, but are listed there without any distinction from the record of mere scribal variants wanting authority.¹

In connexion with the acted form of the Windsor text (in which Sir Walter includes the revisions of *f*) a question may arise. He tacitly assumes that hypothetical MS. *f*, containing the final revisions, was written prior to the Windsor performance. This view is perhaps not so certain as to pass without strict examination; but the necessity to inquire into the contrary possibility is not even envisaged. There can be no question that revisions up to and including the γ MS. represent versions prior to performance, since in them additions are made which could have been only for acting purposes. However, there may be some question whether the final stage of known alterations, as subsequently made in γ to form γ' and from this last transcribed to form MS. *f*, do not differentiate themselves more prominently as literary revisions which Jonson might have made at

in his reconstruction has avoided it deliberately. In truth, to have proceeded farther with parallel texts might have introduced real anomalies. If only a single text were to be critically reconstructed, an attempt to penetrate back closer to α in the forms of the accidentals, even to the point where it might be said one had no copy-text, would be an interesting experiment, especially for the *Masque* which is unusual for the materials available.

¹ It is true that they are discussed in the Introduction and again in the appended textual notes, but—as printed—their relation to the text is obscured as one works through the text and its immediate apparatus. In connexion with the B21 variant mentioned, there occurs a rare contradiction, doubtless indicative of a change of opinion, inadvertently unresolved. In the Introduction (p. 60, n. 2) this alteration is said to be scribal, but in the textual note on p. 205 it is judged to be authorial. Possibly another similar contradiction exists between the discussion of W507-33 in the Introduction (p. 41, under section 6) and the textual note on the lines at p. 216; if not, the material in the textual note should have been presented, or referred to, in the Introduction argument, which is misleading without it.

any time subsequent to the Windsor performance with eventual publication in mind. If this is so, some of the deletions and revisions, whether Jonson's or Buc's, which Greg assigns to enforced decorum in performance may have had no relation to the Windsor presentation and could have been made, as plausibly, with a view to the public presentation of the material in print. It would seem, then, that the strict logic which barred certain revisions from the Belvoir text may perhaps have been violated for the Windsor, and that the version as here given is not so certainly that of the Windsor performance as is assumed. I am in no position to assert that the *f* revisions are in fact post-performance, since I do not know, and whether the exact truth could ever be demonstrated is perhaps dubious. My point is only that this is a possibility that Sir Walter has not considered, and thus that he has presented no specific evidence in favour of his tacit contrary assumption, although some features of his text depend upon the question.

The matter may possibly have some relation to the interpretation of the history of the text that we are justified in making from the family tree offered us. The prime problem was whether the extant texts derived from 'continuous copy', that is, from the same early manuscript in successive stages of revision, or from transcripts which themselves had been successively revised. As Sir Walter remarks at the conclusion of his demonstration (p. 71), 'the textual facts are inexorable' against 'continuous copy', since the family grouping of variants seems explicable by no other hypothesis than that represented in his tree. However, Sir Walter did not then survey the implications, though they are very odd indeed. A tree for an Elizabethan text ought to carry conviction on practical as well as on theoretical grounds. Only one month separated the August Burley from the September Windsor performance, and there seems no reason to suppose that the Windsor presentation was planned before the Burley-Belvoir success. Yet on the facts of the genetic grouping of variants, within the space of this month the transcript d_1 was made of Jonson's α papers, this transcript lying behind the D_1 duodecimo. Moreover, this transcript must have been made, on the evidence of some late Burley additions found only in the composite texts, before the Burley performance (Sir Walter thinks perhaps as a presentation copy for the occasion). At some indeterminate time following the Burley-Belvoir performances, when the production at Windsor was decided upon, Jonson began to construct a revised version on the basis of the α papers, and it was from this α' in an incomplete state of revision that a scribal transcript was made, which is labelled β and from which *H* derived. In this very β MS. Jonson then added further revisions, and this altered β' was then scribally transcribed to form MS. γ , the ultimate source of the D_2 cancellans leaves. However, if we are to believe that *f* was pre-Windsor, we must thereupon take it (though the next set of revisions was relatively minor and was without the additions characteristic of earlier revision) that Jonson revised γ afresh to produce γ' , from which *f* was thereupon transcribed (the source of NF) to effect the final Windsor version. This *f* then lay among Jonson's papers without any further revision until, after his death, it was presumably found by Digby and used as printer's copy for the Folio text.

What strikes one first in this reconstruction is the really extraordinary amount of scribal transcription within a limited time and the manner in which Jonson

discarded his own manuscript and used two transcripts (β and γ) for successive stages of revision leading to the final transcript f . If we may suppose that at first he considered the α' revisions sufficient, the transcript β is understandable, since this copy might have been intended for the presenters. On the evidence of β , however, it was not given to them, or else was returned for revision. Why, thereupon, the transcript γ was made is not easy to explain except on the hypothesis that Jonson then thought his task completed and was concerned to provide his noble actors with clean copy. But if γ were given to them, it must have been returned,¹ on the evidence for further revision found in NF deriving from f . Since, given the essentially minor revision, only a peculiar passion for clean copy would explain a further transcript for theatrical purposes beyond γ , it is possible to query whether the implications of this chain of events suggest necessarily that γ must have been revised to γ' and thereupon transcribed to form f before the Windsor performance. If not, we might perhaps be permitted to conjecture that the revisions represented by β' provided (in their γ form) the true Windsor acting version. It could then follow that β' was transcribed and the resulting γ given to the actors, but at the same time for his private purposes Jonson had a second transcript made (from γ) of this supposedly final form (possibly with a presentation copy in mind). If so, this would be MS. f , which in Sir Walter Greg's tree would then substitute for γ' , and NF would derive from post-Windsor revisions made in its f' form. The inexorable textual facts do not seem to preclude such a hypothesis, and on a conjectural basis it may offer a greater air of probability than this section of Sir Walter's tree if we consider the physical facts of the numerous transcriptions and also the requirements of copy for the presenters of the masque. To reduce to two Sir Walter's three transcripts made within a month with copy for acting in view, offers some advantage to probability.²

There is still one very minor matter remaining in connexion with Sir Walter's tree. Some few variants exist between D_1 and H on the one hand, and NF (or D_2 NF) on the other, in which on grounds of personal preference it might appear that the NF variants are superior, not as revisions but as corrections. A case in point is considered by Sir Walter on p. 60, D_1 H 'Let it alone' versus NF 'Let her alone'. The first is acceptable, but the second so natural as to cast some doubts on the actual correctness of 'Let it alone',³ except that it must derive from

¹ Since we cannot forget the fact that the presenters of the masque required a copy (not shown hypothetically on Sir Walter Greg's tree), we must assume—if we follow him—that f represents this copy finally returned to Jonson, or else that an independent transcript of f was made for them. If the latter, it is difficult to see why Jonson had f transcribed for himself, since γ' would have done very well for his private copy, very few alterations having been made in it. Otherwise, the assumption that f served as copy for the Folio would require the first hypothesis, which may or may not seem natural. However, we must remember that the hypothesis that f was found among Jonson's papers by Digby and thereupon used as printer's copy rests, itself, on an assumption.

² The remaining oddity is that Jonson, though shown to have overlooked at intervals the text of the scribal transcripts in his possession and to have used them as the basis for successive revision, yet permitted the accumulation of scribal error to stand, including the omission of lines, and errors in the speech-headings as well as in text.

³ The more especially since it could very well have been a corruption by assimilation from the next few words in the speech.

α repeated in β . Sir Walter's consideration of this variant, and its implications, is rather tentative, and the conclusions he reaches in footnote 2 on this page turn out to be illegitimate if we may take it that his text notes represent his final views.¹ It is proper to point out, therefore, that the tacit assumption that α represents Jonson's autograph needs further testing, for it may be that we have the same situation obtaining here as later with the Windsor text, that Jonson wished to keep a fair copy of his masque, and hence there is some possibility that α could represent a scribal transcript and Jonson's autograph papers an X in back of α . If it could be found that there are real errors not explicable as authorial slips of the pen in which α and β agree, some such hypothesis would prove necessary.

In the rigorous textual examination which Sir Walter has made there is one final point which may require further investigation. The very real probability, on his evidence, that in some unknown way D_1 occasionally contaminated D_2 , passages of similar material is so very interesting because of its obvious relation to the unsolved similar problem of Q_1 's influence on Q_2 of *Hamlet* that one would like to know more of the specific mechanical method involved. Since the point was not of importance for the specific textual decisions in question, Sir Walter was content to present the evidence for contamination without inquiring further into the exact method by which it could have occurred; but one would like to know whether there is evidence of annotated copy, of occasional reference in cases of difficulty, or what, and how close are the non-substantive readings between the two.

The space available to a reviewer does not enable him to give equal weight to the virtues of a book, which with Sir Walter Greg's scholarship we may always take for granted, in comparison to the points in the total investigation, not always of major importance, which in the commentator's necessarily limited opinion may call for further research or possibly for different interpretation. The logic which backs the admirable boldness of Sir Walter's approach to textual problems is nowhere better exemplified than in this edition, which is certain to become a classic requiring study and absorption by any textual critic who wants to learn his business.² The innovations in textual theory and in the method of presenting a text with its apparatus should exercise a powerful effect on future textual work, and for the better. This is, in short, a magnificent achievement, the very ripeness of scholarship, as notable for its critical judgement³ as for its logical clarification of more demonstrable textual problems.

FREDSON BOWERS

¹ The first, that the scribe of *f* was given to emendation, as of *heape* for *poure*, is contradicted by the text note assigning this to Jonson. The second, the alteration for concord of a singular to a plural, he gives to the scribe of *f* on the grounds that since this occurred in a passage not acted at Windsor there was no call for Jonson to revise it. Yet the *poure-heape* variant comes in the same passage and under the same restrictions; and if it is Jonsonian, the other is very likely so as well.

² The handling of the same problem in the Oxford edition fails to stand up, in comparison, not only for accuracy but also in a number of interesting ways for logical interpretation of evidence. I have not checked through the numerous cross-references in Sir Walter Greg's volume, but one niggling misprint needs correction: in line 3 of the text on p. 101, for *is read in*.

³ There are few places where I should care to disagree with Sir Walter Greg's judgement

The Life and Works of Joseph Hall, 1574-1656. By T. F. KINLOCH. Pp. 210. London: Staples Press, 1951. 21s. net.

Hall should have a special interest for students if only for the reasons that his career as a writer extended over perhaps the sixty most eventful years of English literary history, from 1597 until his death in 1656, and that in the course of his prolific activity he naturalized four genres into English, the formal Satire, the prose Epistle, the Character, and the Meditation, displaying in each a versatility and mastery of technique that have not yet been justly appraised.

His nineteenth-century biographers, J. Jones and G. Lewis, presented him satisfactorily as a Churchman and a powerful and attractive religious writer, but they did not place him very carefully in his literary context. What is required today is a study showing all the ramifications of Hall's decided though moderate literary genius, but a study which shall at the same time be related to the earlier picture of him as an active and important figure during the Primacy of Laud and a thoughtful exponent of the *via media* as the policy of the Church of England at a time when moderation was a rare and, at the same time, dangerous virtue. Mr. Kinloch's book, though it seems to have this kind of aim before it, unfortunately fails to do more than list and review in a rather superficial way Hall's numerous works. The treatment of the historical and ecclesiastical background is hardly more satisfactory. Thirty-five pages are devoted to Hall's life, a treatment which can hardly be intended to supersede the earlier biographies. Even as an introduction to the remainder of the book, however, this section suffers from a certain thinness and a failure to deal adequately with the later phase, after 1642—dealt with partly by Hall himself in his fine autobiographical work, *Hard Measure* (1647). This tract, incidentally, does not appear in the bibliographical list of Hall's writings which is appended to the book. Among the other omissions are: 1603, *King's Prophecies*; 1608, *Holy Observations*; 1618, *Quo Vadis*; 1620, *The Honour of the Married Clergy*; 1630, *The Reconciler*; 1640, *Christian Moderation*; 1646, *The Balm of Gilead*; and 1650, *The Revelation Unrevealed*.

The work is mainly vitiated by a certain lack of sympathy with Hall himself. Hall's attack on Milton is described as 'vile and entirely unwarranted' (p. 18). The second adjective becomes a little difficult to understand when we consider that, even if Hall was the author of the *Modest Confutation* of 1642, Milton had given the first blow a year earlier with his *Animadversions*. The coarseness of seventeenth-century controversy offends the present-day taste and perhaps for that reason we had best leave it alone and not attempt to take sides. Mr. Kinloch disapproves also of Hall's rather fulsome dedications to royal or noble patrons as though this practice in some way reflected upon his sincerity as a clergyman. In an age when a prelate was always subject to the most insidious and corrupting

in critical matters concerning the emendations or the choice of variant readings in the *Masque*. But it is perhaps worth pointing out that in the corrupt W499-500 discussed on p. 67 he emends rather violently by the substitution of repetitive *be for beare* in the second line, since the substitution of a variant for a repetition is not wholly natural as the source for an error. (The reverse is much more common.) I should suggest that instead there has been simple memorial transposition of verbs, and that we should read *Pallas, shall beare and Truth, be*.

press
marks
of his
O
But c
from
title o
either
and re
was a
is not
it was
specul
of Eli

Next
the
Pp.
Can

Am
comed
its nea
Peniten
of Wyo
items
some e
but cer
formed
had so
almost
to Eng
ment o
in the
as mar

Of th
critical
eminen
Fletche
The Or
his vie
hearted
him a p
there is
dramat

pressure in Church and state, Hall seems to have pursued a line which was remarkably sincere, fearless, and, for the most part, consistent, but this is an aspect of his character which would not be gathered from Mr. Kinloch's book.

One hesitates to challenge Mr. Kinloch on a question of Christian dogmatics. But can Hall be summed up as an 'out-and-out Calvinist'? A sentence like this from a tract written before he accepted his bishopric and bearing the significant title of *Via Media*, surely contains a very non-Calvinist sentiment: 'God does not either actually damn or appoint any soul to damnation without the consideration and respect of sin' (Pratt, vol. ix, p. 821). Hall in fact adopted a position which was as far from out-and-out Calvinism almost as it was from Arminianism. It is not too much to say that for Hall the *via media* was more than a principle; it was a passion pervading his life and thought, entering at one level into his speculative theology and at another into his very prose style, with its fine balance of Elizabethan richness and Puritan austerity.

HAROLD FISCH

Next to Shakespeare. Otway's *Venice Preserv'd* and *The Orphan* and their History on the London Stage. By ALINE MACKENZIE TAYLOR. Pp. ix+328. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press; London: Cambridge University Press, 1950. 45s. net.

Among the productions of the Restoration theatre we may find in certain comedies a grace of style, a measure of shrewdness and authority, but we look to its near-tragic plays with some condescension: we value *Oroonoko* and *The Fair Penitent* and *Venice Preserved* as fragments of social history, as aids for our study of Wycherley and Congreve, but we could never wish them to become recurrent items in our dramatic repertory. Even *All for Love* cannot be praised without some embarrassment. Yet it was not the comedies of the late seventeenth century, but certain plays of Otway and Southerne and Rowe, that were regularly performed in London for 150 years. And, apart from Shakespeare, no Elizabethan had so remarkable a fortune. While Restoration comedy was a temporary, an almost wholly excisable growth, these 'serious' Restoration plays were not alien to English minds from the struggle for the Exclusion Bill to the solid establishment of Victorian virtue. The stage history of these plays reveals a uniformity in the long period of their survival, and we may see their ultimate disappearance as marking a major change in social feeling.

Of this group of dramatists, Otway was the most popular and won the highest critical esteem. In the title of her book Dr. Taylor draws attention to his peculiar eminence, which may be as puzzling to a modern reader as the high standing of Fletcher throughout the seventeenth century. She does indeed show us that both *The Orphan* and *Venice Preserved* depend on the playwright's readiness to shift his viewpoint from scene to scene, from character to character: he can feel wholeheartedly with Belvidera or with Pierre, with Polydore or with Chamont: for him a plot against a woman or against the state is both thrilling and vile. Yet there is no tension between these feelings, as there is in the major Elizabethan dramatists. He seems unconscious of contradiction, he simply pursues each

feeling until the sequence of events leads him to another. He reminds us of Fletcher in this, but the changes of feeling are managed with a graver face. The older dramatist is sophisticated, enjoying his skill in the depiction of passion, never quite at one with the passion itself. Evadne and Panthea are not spared a touch of conscious absurdity from which Otway's heroines are immune. And because Otway's plays are the vehicles for diverse and unrelated feelings, they could be adapted to minor changes in popular inclination through many years. When governmental authority was in disfavour, *Venice Preserved* was Pierre's play; but in different circumstances of production Pierre could be a plain villain.

We are indebted to Dr. Taylor for the thoroughness with which she has traced the changes in emphasis given to these plays in production. In books and periodicals of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries she has found many useful accounts of how the plays were acted at different times. Moreover, she has found critical comments on the plays themselves, which often, while acknowledging Otway's eminence, hint at uneasiness—not because contradictions in the plays' feelings are recognized, but because even Otway is, for the polite reader, at times disturbing. In, for example, an article in the *London Magazine* for March 1768, Jaffier's language to Belvidera in describing their relations is found unnecessary and indecent. Certainly Otway's texts, and Southerne's, were to some degree expurgated for eighteenth- and nineteenth-century performance, and doubtless it was the indelicacy of its story that brought the stage career of *The Orphan* to an end forty years earlier than that of *Venice Preserved*. Increasingly it was felt that 'tragedy' should not be troublesome: its distresses should ever be nobly borne. The flexibility of Otway's feeling, which had kept his plays on the stage for so long, was ultimately the cause of their disappearance.

Dr. Taylor's history throws light both on Otway's plays and on the temper of the years in which they were acted. Her evidence might perhaps have been selected more rigorously, for not every description of acting is illuminating in these ways, but the book does strengthen our understanding of Otway's talent and of the English stage tradition from Betterton to Macready. It would be valuable to have her major findings incorporated in a wider study of the stage history of Restoration plays.

CLIFFORD LEECH

A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration.

By W. W. GREG. Vol. II. Plays 1617-1689: Nos. 350-836. Latin Plays. Lost Plays. London: Printed for the Bibliographical Society at the University Press, Oxford, 1951. Pp. xxxvi+493-1008+Plates LXIV-CXIII. No price given.

It is hard to find anything unpresumptuous and useful to say of this great and long-awaited work. As the first volume appeared in 1939 and has been in use ever since, the general plan and method of execution must be familiar to all serious students. The plays (including masques and triumphs), numbered consecutively, are arranged in chronological order of the earliest surviving edition, and all editions printed before 1700 of plays written before 1642 or first

printed by Mo
Points
(though
United
record
to 1688
from 1
matter
noted
eviden
some
Very l
and we
most o
The li
clusion
would
intoler
have b
plays e
were.

Tha
plishm
of mar
able to
is com
must
handli
wire-li
they ca
so. M
and th
ago' th
already
spare t
it, mea
defeat
in Vol
rapidly
advant
formal
amplif
given a
The P

printed before 1660 are described in the bibliographical technique expounded by McKerrow, with further subtleties devised by Sir Walter Greg himself. Points of interest which escape the formulae are discussed in notes, and useful (though necessarily not exhaustive) lists are given of copies accessible in the United Kingdom and the United States. Volume I (nos. 1-349) brought the record down to 1616 and the present volume (nos. 350-836) carries it from 1617 to 1689, with appendixes of 23 Latin plays from 1581 to 1658 and 187 lost plays from 1504 to 1662. The description of collected editions, other complementary matter, and the general introduction are reserved for Volume III. It should be noted that lost plays are mainly those 'for the former printing of which there is evidence, however slight, but of which no early edition is now known, though some survive in manuscript. Evidence has been very liberally interpreted.' Very liberally indeed, since it includes mere entry in the Stationers' Register, and we can be pretty confident that many of the lost plays so entered, probably most of them, were never printed at all—though we cannot tell which were not. The limitation is entirely justified by the title and scope of the work. The inclusion of lost plays for whose printing there is absolutely no evidence whatever would have expanded the book and rendered it conjectural, both perhaps to an intolerable degree. But it would have been most useful, and it might almost have been defended as a mere extension of the accepted principle: for if the plays existed they could have been printed, and perhaps some of them actually were.

That is asking greedily for more than we were promised. This full accomplishment of the design which Sir Walter proposed to himself will meet the need of many readers with varied interests. The private or public collector will be able to identify a doubtful issue, and to satisfy himself whether a particular copy is complete or wherein it falls short. The ever-growing number of students who must work entirely or largely with photostats or microfilms without familiar handling of a copy of their book are partly compensated for being deprived of wire-lines, chain-lines, watermarks, and perhaps visibly conjugate leaves, and they can form an idea of what in particular the book actually is. At least, I think so. Many such readers may not be experienced bibliographers or wish to be, and they may be daunted by some of the symbolic descriptions. Twenty years ago¹ the author thought that some bibliographers 'will consider that I have already elaborated convention beyond the limits of convenience', and he does not spare them here. There are indeed many additional conventions (not all, I take it, meant for general use, but employed for brevity here), but they should not defeat anyone who wants to know and will use the *Library* article and the key in Volume I. Those for whom a hasty glance will suffice can get what they want rapidly, with the confidence that it is right so far, and ignore the rest. It is an advantage of the notation that it does not force the writer to say anything in his formal description which he may wish to alter in a note, though he may wish to amplify it. Thus the collation of *The Great Duke of Florence* (no. 505) is correctly given as 'A⁴(—A₁) B—K⁴L₁' with a note that L₁ is A₁, and its immediate successor *The Platonic Lovers* (no. 506) is 'A⁴(—A₄) B—K⁴L₁' with its appropriate note.

¹ *The Library*, 4th ser., xiv (1933), 382.

A student of good will should be able to understand Greg's description. But there is still a lurking danger. With this great body before him of descriptions from a master hand the beginner will be tempted to use Greg as a model for his own descriptions, and I do not like to think what he and his printer may make of it.¹ McKerrow's less condensed notation is safer to use.

There are challenges in these volumes not only to students of particular works but also, through the annalistic arrangement, of literary and social development in a wider field. There is room for one instance. We have learned to associate the fertile years in earlier Elizabethan dramatic publication with the heavy incidence of the plague. No such correspondence is apparent in the years 1617-42. Neglecting occasional pieces like masques and triumphs and collections like the Shakespeare folio which upset the balance, the number of previously unprinted plays published annually from 1617 to 1628 ranged from 0 to a maximum of 4 (in 1622). There is a slight rise to 5 in 1629 and then 8, 11, 10, and 12 in the four following years, whereafter it falls for a time and then becomes greater than ever. The great plague year of 1625 produced one play, and the next two years none. This calls for explanation.

I have checked the descriptions where I could, and have found no flaw in Sir Walter's impeccable accuracy. The publisher and printer too deserve every praise for maintaining under less favourable conditions the standards set in 1939. The top is not gilt, but I see no other relaxing of physical standards of production. Volume II is in every way a worthy part of a great work.

A. K. McILWRAITH

The Seventeenth Century. Studies in the History of English Thought and Literature from Bacon to Pope. By RICHARD FOSTER JONES and others writing in his honor. Pp. viii+392. Stanford: Stanford University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1951. \$7.00; 42s. net.

Many students have been and will continue to be indebted to Richard Foster Jones, especially for what he has done to clarify the relations between literature and scientific thought in the seventeenth century and after. The volume now reviewed was presented to him in 1951 on his sixty-fifth birthday, in token of the gratitude he has earned. It is made up partly of five articles by Professor Jones gathered from the various journals in which they first appeared, and partly of essays by other well-known scholars, not published before, on themes near to his major interests. These contributors were invited to deal with aspects of 'three allied seventeenth- and eighteenth-century topics': science in its bearings on literature; literary and rhetorical theory and practice; and ideas of broadly philosophical import. In the book which has resulted literary and rhetorical *practice*,

¹ The notation avoids the unquotable monstrosities of Record type, but it is liable to tax the resources of many a good printer, and perhaps to defeat him if the copy is not utterly perspicuous. Clarity if not meaning may depend on fine differences in spacing, and a dash meaning 'minus' is just a shade longer in the Bibliography than one meaning 'to'.

the art of writing or speaking, gets very little direct attention, but the opportunity to concentrate on the 'background' of literature has been very profitably taken.

In his study of the conflict between *Ancients and Moderns* (1936) Professor Jones went very thoroughly into the ideas which made that opposition vital; and traced the progress of a war which was not at all restricted to the field of literature. The question whether human capacities had found their utmost reach in the ancient world and had since been in decline, or were still fresh and strong enough to match the ancient performances, was closely bound up with considerations about the possibilities of the new science and of future 'progress'; and Professor Jones indicated how deep were the emotions involved and how powerful the armaments on each side.

That study was long in preparation, for its drift, though not its fullness of detail, was anticipated sixteen years earlier by the first of the articles reprinted in this collection: 'The Background of *The Battle of the Books*'. Four additional articles are concerned with the effect of the scientific movement on English criticism of the neo-classical period and on the development in various directions of that plainer English prose which the scientists favoured.

The purposes of such inquiries are not always best served by the best literature. In the first of the fourteen essays that follow Professor Jones's, L. I. Bredvold considers 'The Invention of the Ethical Calculus', a subject having little first-hand connexion with the major works of Augustan literature but usefully illustrating the faith in mathematical and scientific processes which characterized the age and affected many of its writers. Science in one aspect or another is discussed in several other essays, J. F. Fulton's on 'Medicine in the Seventeenth Century' (chiefly about accounts of the plague), G. Sherburn's on 'Pope and "the great shew of Nature"', and B. Willey's on 'The Touch of Cold Philosophy'.

Some of the essays draw their material from sociology or politics, H. Davis writing on 'The Conversation of the Augustans', G. B. Parks on 'Travel as Education', M. Y. Hughes on 'Milton's Treatment of Reformation History in "The Tenure of Kings"', G. F. Sensabaugh on 'Milton and the Attempted Whig Revolution', and W. Haller on 'John Foxe and the Puritan Revolution.'

Three essays have specifically to do with critical theory or practice and each adds something material to what has been generally known or recognized about its theme. E. N. Hooker treats freshly of the circumstances which gave actuality to Pope's observations on wit in *An Essay on Criticism*, and provides among other things a valuable account of earlier pronouncements on the subject, though there is no mention of Cowley's 'Ode'. C. D. Thorpe estimates 'Addison's contribution to criticism', qualifying some earlier assessments but claiming great importance, both intrinsic and historical, for Addison's work. 'A Note on Dryden's Criticism' by E. M. W. Tillyard extols Dryden's 'perfection of tone' in matters of comparative literature; and illustrates the use he made of the intellectual freedom which his tone implies.

The remaining essays are V. K. Whitaker's on the uneasy yoking of 'Philosophy and Romance in Shakespeare's "Problem" Comedies' and Helen C. White's on 'John Donne and the Psychology of Spiritual Effort', an analysis of Donne's strivings towards self-knowledge and the satisfactions of the Christian faith.

Professor Marjorie Nicolson introduces the volume with an appropriately warm appreciation of R. F. Jones's personality and achievements.

L. C. MARTIN

English Literary Criticism: 17th and 18th Centuries. By J. W. H. ATKINS.
Pp. xi+383. London: Methuen, 1951. 21s. net.

With this volume the late Professor Atkins continued his disciplined march through English criticism to the close of the eighteenth century. Like its predecessors, it has solid merits: it is based on wide and alert reading, it is well planned and clearly written, and it is the work of a man who could look before and after, and who was therefore able to see the criticism of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as part of a long and continuing process. Of its usefulness to the student there can be no question. But it is just here that certain doubts begin to make themselves heard. Professor Atkins has given such generous and detailed summaries of critics like Dryden and Johnson that the student may well ask himself if it is really necessary to read through the two volumes of Ker's *Dryden* or *The Lives of the Poets*. Of course there is a good deal of comment and much useful and unobtrusive cross-reference; but the final impression left by this book is that its author has compiled a masterly précis rather than a history of criticism. When he is treating the minor critics there is much to be said for his summarizing method: after all, most of us probably don't want to read the Rev. William Wotton, or Welsted, or Lord Kames, or Beattie, and we can safely rely on Professor Atkins to pick out anything significant in their critical work. But with a voluminous critic like Dryden his method defeats itself. We are taken through Dryden's critical writings in their chronological order, and as a result we are never allowed to follow his views on any given topic from beginning to end. With Dryden, too, the simple précis will not do; we must have light and shade, or else we shall be left with the notion that Dryden was continually contradicting himself.

The period with which this volume deals is the one usually described as neo-classical. It is part of Professor Atkins's case, however, that the English critics were much less wedded to neo-classicism than has often been supposed. He may well be right in this, but he surely allowed himself to move too far in the contrary direction. According to his own showing, the break with the Renaissance tradition and the acceptance of neo-classicism came about the middle of the seventeenth century; but 'after 1674 . . . counter-influences were already at work' (p. 357). This gives neo-classicism a run of about a quarter of a century, and thereafter Professor Atkins is mainly concerned with showing how it was constantly being modified, contradicted, and finally rejected. One cannot help feeling that with him the wish was father to the thought. Looking on the period under review as a 'bridge between the early strivings of the Renaissance period and the great achievements of the 19th Century' and as 'the seed-time of the later 19th Century harvest' (pp. v, vi), he unconsciously tends to give prominence to the critical nonconformists, to understate the sound neo-classical basis in the

criticism of Johnson and Reynolds while emphasizing any features in it that are 'liberal', and to play down such a critic as Goldsmith because he has 'little bearing on the critical development'. In dealing with Gray he has, of course, no difficulty in finding plenty of material to support his thesis; but here perhaps he insufficiently distinguishes between what Gray wrote in a private letter to a friend and what he made public. What was not published until some time after Gray's death could have had little effect on contemporary opinion.

But the solid virtues of this and his other books remain. Few English scholars have used their retirement to better purpose than Professor Atkins. To present the outlines of English criticism as firmly as he has done, and at the same time to give the individual critics such a detailed treatment, is an achievement that must earn our gratitude and respect.

JAMES R. SUTHERLAND

The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift. Edited by HERBERT DAVIS. Volume VI. **Political Tracts 1711-1713.** Pp. xxviii+220. Oxford: Blackwell, 1951. 21s. net.

The war led to a delay of seven years in the continued publication of Dr. Herbert Davis's admirable edition of Swift's prose works. Happily progress is now being made. In four years three volumes have appeared, the ninth, the seventh, and the sixth, this last containing political tracts written by Swift in support of the policy of Oxford and Bolingbroke directed to ending the continental war and promoting a treaty of peace. It was in the *Examiner* and in these tracts that Swift displayed his superb gifts as a political pamphleteer. No author of the Whig party could successfully restrain the flowing tide of his influence; not even Dr. Hare, Marlborough's chaplain, the ablest of his critics, who certainly got in some shrewd thrusts. Macaulay, no lover of Swift, here pays him unreserved tribute. 'Every judicious reader', he writes, 'must be struck by the peculiarities which distinguish Swift's political tracts from all similar works produced by mere men of letters. . . . Swift writes like a man who has passed his whole life in the midst of public business, to whom the most important affairs of state are as familiar as his weekly bills.' It was this gift, carrying instant conviction, which swayed the thoughts of ordinary men.

It was on 2 November 1710 that Swift took over the *Examiner*, with No. 13, and continued it to No. 45, 14 June 1711. Here he began to display gifts which heralded his outstanding tract, *The Conduct of the Allies*. It is curious that Dr. Davis, misleadingly for the uninformed reader, should observe of Swift that he 'had successfully launched the *Examiner*', whereas twelve numbers had appeared before he took it over, making of it indeed a far more effective organ. The stated purpose of the *Examiner* papers, 'that the Nation may be truly informed from what springs our own Grievances, and the Hopes of our Enemies have risen', was also the aim of *The Conduct of the Allies* in a more elaborate form and with more trenchant vigour.

Dr. Davis's third volume contained, in addition to the *Examiner*, pamphlets belonging to the first twelve months of Swift's activity in the service of the Tory

ministry. Although, within this period, the *Short Character of Wharton* and *A New Journey to Paris* rapidly ran into further editions, their popular appeal was completely outstripped by the insatiable demand, throughout the country, for further copies of *The Conduct of the Allies*. The first edition appeared on 27 November 1711, five further London editions were printed in almost as many weeks, and to these we must add Dublin and Edinburgh editions.

In his own words the writing of the *Conduct* cost Swift 'much time and trouble'. As early as the beginning of September we get the first hint that he was at work upon it. He was at pains, consulting members of the ministry, to avoid 'mistakes in point of fact'. After its appearance it was with an author's satisfaction that he could tell Stella: 'The noise it makes is extraordinary.'

The editor's textual notes, as they relate to the *Conduct*, are of particular value and interest. At the instance of Harley significant alterations were made in the second and fourth editions. After that Swift left the work to the printer. For his own text, therefore, Dr. Davis follows the fourth edition. Although Faulkner, the Dublin printer, did not embody these changes in vol. v of his edition of the *Works*, 1738, further corrections to the *Conduct*, which he introduced, can hardly have come from any but the author's hand.

Other tracts in this volume include the important *Some Advice to the October Club*, *Some Remarks on the Barrier Treaty*, and that admirable piece of writing, *Some Reasons*, addressed to Whig peers of moderate principles, counselling them to support the government. Of particular interest also are extracts from newspapers of the day which can confidently be ascribed to Swift's pen.

In common with Dr. Davis's previous introductions to volumes in the series, the introduction to this volume has the merit of presenting lucidly, within comparatively few pages, all that the reader should know to gain an understanding of the historical setting of the pamphlets and of Swift's immediate purpose. Further, the introduction has contributions to offer from new and direct research. The textual collations continue the same high standard of thoroughness and accuracy.

HAROLD WILLIAMS

The Complete Works of William Diaper. Edited by DOROTHY BROUGHTON. Pp. lxxviii+363. (The Muses' Library.) London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1952. 15s. net.

Dr. Broughton's work is not only an attractive addition to the 'Muses' Library', but also a valuable contribution to the study of Augustan minor verse. To most of us, Diaper has been little more than 'one Diaper a Poet . . . a poor little short Wretch' in Swift's *Journal to Stella*. In this, the first reprint of his work since the eighteenth century, and the first complete edition, he emerges as a versatile, mildly experimental, and always delightful minor poet in pastoral and didactic modes, deserving study as well as recognition. Into one volume Dr. Broughton has gathered *Dryades*; or, *The Nymph's Prophecy*, a pleasing example of rural-philosophical poetry; *Brent*, a realistic topographical poem on the dreich district in Somerset where Diaper endured a cure of souls; some miscellaneous imitations

and translations, including a remarkable version of the first two books of Oppian's *Halieutica*; and *Nereides: or, Sea-Eclogues*, in which Diaper breaks away from the Sannazaro tradition of piscatory pastoral, and makes his characters truly 'wat'ry'—Tritons, sea-nymphs, Proteus, and even two choric fish—instead of mere Arcadian fishermen, 'Coasters' who 'always keep within sight of Shore, and never venture into the Ocean'. Dr. Broughton gives a full and pleasantly written critical account of the poems, placing Diaper's contributions to various genres in their historical context, and assessing his merits without the extravagance which so often mars 'discoveries' of minor poets. She comments with tact and scholarly thoroughness on Diaper's sources and affinities, and provides a glossary of fishes both useful and intrinsically pleasing. She has selected her copy-text judiciously, and treated it with sensible conservatism. Professor Dobrée, who initiated her work on Diaper, contributes an amiable foreword.

Diaper is no mean manipulator of the couplet, though he lacks vocal power and the ability to sustain rhythmical patterns through a paragraph. His chief merits are his sense of atmosphere, particularly in woodland and in the depths of the sea; and his sensitiveness to words. To this second characteristic Dr. Broughton might have given more critical attention. Diaper has only a little of Thomson's keen perception of natural detail, and a little of the 'pre-romantic' enthusiasm for nature; but his description, whether of country scenes or of submarine life, is vivid, precise, and often, within the limits of pastoral conventions, delightfully fresh. Such phrases as 'the *Halcyon* builds her wavering Nest', 'her rising Breasts were white as polish'd Shells', 'where airy Daemons dance the wanton Round', 'Bright icy Spangles gild the shining Oar, / And snowy Flakes have whit'ned all the Shoar', and 'The flouncing *Horse* here restiff drives his Way, / And *Soles* on Sands their softer Bellies lay', are the work of more than just another Augustan versifier.

One point which has escaped the eye of Dr. Broughton, but which deserves investigation, is that Diaper appears to owe two attractive elements in his poetry to the example of Dryden. (i) There are passages of description in *Dryades* which recall both the diction and the atmosphere of Dryden's fairy poetry in the *Fables*—'The Wife of Bath's Tale', 'The Flower and the Leaf', and 'Theodore and Honoria'. Dr. Broughton compares *Dryades* with *Windsor Forest*, and points out that Diaper, although he gives due place to classical myth, shows more interest than Pope does in native fairy lore (p. xlv). But Diaper's poetical account of his walk in moonlit solitude, his sense of 'faery', the Dryad's description of supernatural activity beneath the moon, and the explanation of her vanishing at dawn, contain many clear echoes of similar passages in 'The Flower and the Leaf'. (ii) The quietly whimsical accounts of fish life, in human terms, in the *Halieuticks*, and especially the descriptions of marine amours, owe a good deal in tone and spirit to Dryden's treatment of the animals and bees in his translation of the *Georgics*. Indeed, a comparison of the whole pastoral style and diction of Dryden and Diaper might be of considerable historical interest.

JAMES KINSLEY

The Background of Thomson's *Liberty*. By ALAN DUGALD MCKILLOP. Pp. vi+123 (Rice Institute Pamphlet, vol. xxxviii, no. 2). Houston, Tx.: Rice Institute, 1951. No price given.

In this monograph in English Professor McKillop has done for *Liberty* what he has already done for *The Seasons*, and as thoroughly and readably. The poem, as we all know, is a history of civilization from the 'Patriot' point of view, diversified by the usual Thomsonian medley of contemporary thought. 'The role of philosophic virtuoso and commentator', as Professor McKillop says, 'is important': but *Liberty*

... is hampered by the ready-made interpretation of history. ... The problem of evil leads in *The Seasons* to descriptive variety and contrast, in *Liberty* to somewhat stereotyped polemic. The result amounts to artistic failure, but also affords valuable illustrations of the course of popular thought in the Age of Walpole.

Though the poem was not written before 1735-6, Thomson was already toying with the idea when he accompanied the young Talbot on the grand tour at the end of 1730. At first, apparently, it might have been a 'ruins of Rome' poem, which Dyer was later to do so well, and his reading of Addison and Addison's sources such as Lassel, Ray, and Burnet, to which he added later ones, provided the substance. So much for 'the View of Italy' to which one chapter is devoted. The next, on 'Ancient History', with which it appears Thomson dealt freely enough, shows his indebtedness to Rollin, and perhaps the Abbé Vertot, with a dash of Shaftesbury; but when we come to 'The Fine Arts' the matter becomes more complicated. Thomson's own collection of prints shows 'a heavy predominance of "Roman" and "Lombard", and . . . a dominant interest in the heroic and sentimental treatment of classical historical and Biblical subjects'. Light-touching Lorrain, savage Rosa, and learned Poussin represent a later taste, encouraged perhaps by Jonathan Richardson. As regards 'Northern Liberty', Temple was a main source, to which other recent writings were added, but the sailing is not really plain till we come to 'Political Intentions', where 'Oldcastle' in *The Craftsman* gave the lead. So much was Thomson absorbed by the theme, that snatches of the poem appear in barely disguised form in later versions of *The Seasons*.

Professor McKillop does not, of course, confine himself to statement, or to the poem itself. He abounds in critical remarks, relating the poem to others and to Thomson's letters, with a brief conclusion on its later fortunes and its slight influence. 'But good words for *Liberty* have seldom been part of the generous praise long accorded to Thomson', and Professor McKillop does not add to them, though his analysis is extremely interesting; 'a systematic expository project made his blank verse harsh and laboured, full of awkward inversions and choppy antitheses that strive for unwarranted emphasis and intensity'. Yet it has its pleasurable moments for those who have not, with Dr. Johnson, consigned it 'to harbour spiders and to gather dust', and though no amount of comment can make it exciting, it will always have its attractions as a period piece to be dipped into occasionally. The service this modestly named 'pamphlet' performs is to set it in its place in the picture, and to link it up with other goings-on of the time.

BONAMY DOBRÉE

Agrarian Age: A Background for Wordsworth. By KENNETH MACLEAN.
Pp. xiv + 110 (Yale Studies in English, vol. 115). New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1950. \$3.00; 20s. net.

This is a useful piece of critical pioneering. Though on a less ambitious scale it can be compared with L. C. Knights's *Drama and Society in the Age of Jonson*. In the three essays that make up his book Professor MacLean has tried, he tells us, to relate the 'strong agrarian sentiment controlling the development of literature and art in the later eighteenth century' to 'certain aspects of [its] economic life and thought'. And on the whole, if the argument is a little untidy at times, he has succeeded. The first and much the longest of the three essays is devoted to the economics of rural 'life', from Tull and 'Turnip' Townshend (incidentally Professor MacLean attributes this nickname, incorrectly surely, to Pope) to Arthur Young and Coke of Norfolk, and to their literary repercussions. The point of greatest interest that emerges from this essay is the curious unawareness shown by the poets of this period, as well as by such later writers as Washington Irving and Miss Mitford, of what was really happening in the country. Clare seems to be the only poet who brings the enclosures into his poems, and Clare's objection to enclosure was simply that it spoiled the landscape and deprived him of the birds and wild flowers that he had loved as a child. The second essay deals more briefly with economic 'thought' as represented by the French physiocrats and Adam Smith. Like Young and his Board of Agriculture the physiocrats favoured large farming units, whereas Adam Smith, like Wordsworth, was consistently on the side of the small-holder. This discussion—which is admirably documented, as indeed the whole book is—prepares the way for the third essay, which is on 'Wordsworth as Agrarian'. Professor MacLean shows that Wordsworth had a far greater understanding of the economic realities of country life than such poets as Goldsmith and Cowper, or even Crabbe. In the Lake District, however, the economic problem *par excellence* was not the causes and effects of enclosure but the decay of domestic industries owing to factory competition. At the same time, as Professor MacLean makes clear, Wordsworth's idealization of the Westmorland and Cumberland 'statesman' was at least partly literary. The virtue and innocence of the peasantry had been extolled by Rousseauists like Thomas Day and Blake, and Rousseauist painters like Gainsborough and Morland, while the ballad revival and Burns's poems had combined to propagate a picture of the peasant as a creature of primitive passion. In 'Michael' we have a convergence of economic doctrine (Thomas Poole, Wordsworth's model for the poem, shared Adam Smith's views on the noxiousness of big farms) and a fashionable sentimentality.

Professor MacLean describes his book as 'tentative and experimental'. His social history and economics are certainly rather amateurish and unsophisticated. He loses himself more than once in the intricacies of open-field farming, and his attempt to pass off *The Deserted Village* as a reflection of contemporary realities is based on the misunderstanding of a passage in H. L. Gray's *English Field Systems*. A more serious matter is the failure to realize that the 'strong agrarian sentiment' he is analysing had most of its economic roots in the towns and not in

the country. He has some good things to say, for example, about the cult of the picturesque, but it is a mistake to treat the objections of men like Gilpin and Alison to enclosure as wholly non-economic. The notion that the countryside's *raison d'être* is the views with which it rewards the successful townsman is a direct product of urban capitalism. And the economic background of *The Prelude* is surely only one stage farther removed. With the development in the second and third generations of a capitalist leisured class the country becomes a place for the townsman to live in and not just a place for him to visit or retire to. Under these circumstances a more substantial ruralism is needed than the lighting and colour effects provided by the picturesque. In the nineteenth century this demand would seem to have been supplied by the Wordsworthian religion of nature, which might be defined as the picturesque *stiffened* by urban escapism. These, however, are the deeper waters of sociology. Professor MacLean has preferred, perhaps wisely, to keep to the economic shallows.

F. W. BATESON

Elizabeth Gaskell: Her Life and Work. By A. B. HOPKINS. Pp. 384. London: John Lehmann, 1952. 21s. net.

This is the fullest biography of Mrs. Gaskell that has yet appeared; Miss Hopkins (already known from an article¹ on 'Dickens and Mrs. Gaskell', illuminating the difficulties of serial publication) has made good use of the letters, many previously unpublished, in the Brotherton and Manchester collections, among others, and also of little-known published material. She says, too modestly, that 'it has been simply a process of putting two and two together more consistently than has been done before'. The process is not simple for any Victorian writer (especially for one who usually dates her letters by the day of the week) and its results are valuable. It is frankly admitted that little is known of Mrs. Gaskell's life before 1848, especially her girlhood, but the little that is known is fully and fairly set out, without any straining of the evidence. As a biography this work can hardly be superseded, though it is hoped that it may one day be supplemented by a complete annotated edition of the delightful letters. Very little appears to have been missed; the two letters from Wordsworth in 1840, though concerned not with literature but an oak chest, deserve a reference, especially as they seem to imply some slight previous acquaintance (they were printed in De Selincourt's edition).

Miss Hopkins is especially successful in projecting her subject as an attractive (but not simple) personality, social and domestic, and in giving a clearer view of her family life, including the hitherto neglected Rev. William Gaskell, than any previous biographer. She is well assisted by a generous supply of portraits, including five of Mrs. Gaskell, one of her husband, and one (by Rothenstein) of Meta and Julia in 1889. The particular friendship that is most fully substantiated by correspondence now first published is that with George Smith, the publisher; it is only unfortunate that both here and on Charles Eliot Norton there are occasional superfluous comments (e.g. on pp. 212, 224, 228-9), apparently

¹ *Huntington Library Quarterly*, ix (1946), 357-85.

directed at readers thought likely to misinterpret these transparently normal relationships—readers who, if they exist, were best silently disregarded. Smith's attempt to beat down her terms for the *Life of Charlotte Brontë*, however, deserves more comment than it gets; his 'reputation for liberality' had already been blown upon by Charlotte Brontë herself, disappointed at the 'perhaps not quite equitable' offer of £500 for *Villette*.

Although without the assistance of new facts, Miss Hopkins has also made a positive contribution in her chapters on *Ruth* and the *Life*; the complexity of *Ruth's* context in contemporary opinion (varying from its burning by fathers of families to Clough's view that it was 'a little too timid') is usefully defined, and the remarkably compact and judicious account of the writing and reception of the *Life* and the emphasis on its lasting value could hardly be bettered. Critical evaluation of Mrs. Gaskell's other work is not remarkable, seldom going beyond description, appreciation, and expression of personal preferences; nor has the author attempted to relate it to that of other novelists, which she acknowledges as 'long overdue'. But as a study of the life, in itself and as a matrix of the work, Miss Hopkins's book will be found indispensable.

KATHLEEN TILLOTSON

Matthew Arnold the Ethnologist. By FREDERIC E. FAVERTY. Pp. vii+241 (Northwestern University Studies in the Humanities, 27). Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1951. \$5.00.

But was Matthew Arnold an ethnologist? 'It must be admitted . . . that Arnold was no systematic racialist' (p. 1), Mr. Faverty replies, and adds in a final summing-up, 'After all, Arnold was merely following the *Zeitgeist*' (p. 192). Mr. Faverty hedges, but Arnold himself had no doubts. In these fields 'the mere literary critic must owe his whole safety to his tact in choosing authorities to follow' (*Works*, vol. v, Introduction, p. vii). An odd preface accompanies the odd title:

This book deals with some of the maddest of theories and one of the sanest of men—nineteenth-century racial doctrines and Matthew Arnold.

Nineteenth-century theories confusing race, nation, and linguistic group are now as outmoded as the phlogiston theory of combustion, but Mr. Faverty labels them 'mad' because they revived 'the Neanderthal in man', or, as we may translate, because modern claims of 'Nordic' superiority and modern anti-semitism can be shown to depend on them indirectly. It remains a good step from *On the Study of Celtic Literature* to Buchenwald, and surely Mr. Faverty is ill advised in trying to inject topicality into what is essentially a painstaking account of the references to racial and national characteristics in Arnold's prose works.

To such errors of taste must be added what I believe to be an error of judgement in the author's choice of method. The book contains seven chapters (and an imposing apparatus of notes) with titles such as *The Teutomaniacs*, *The Celt*, *The Semitic vs. the Indo-European Genius*: that is to say, the treatment is by

subject rather than strictly chronological. Yet in weighing Ar. oldian *dicta* overriding importance attaches to date and propagandist intention, for Arnold's opinions develop and he is persistently the advocate. For example, thirty-three years separate the young man who snorted to Clough about Francis Newman—'One would think to read him that articles, biblical inspiration, etc. etc. were as much the natural functions of a man as to eat and copulate' (*Letters to Clough*, p. 115)—from the elderly Higher Critic who was so severe on poor Renan and the French goddess Aselgeia. To disregard these variables of date and intention is to invite disorder and spend time unravelling 'contradictions'.

Mr. Faverty notices and is puzzled by Arnold's 'vigorous rejection of the racial hypothesis' (p. 22) at the close of *Popular Education in France* (1861), and it is abundantly clear that there are inconsistencies in Arnold's picture of the Frenchman as a Celt. The Celt lacked genius for the plastic arts, Arnold held, and in 1910 Alfred Nutt pointed out that this would do only for the Welsh and Irish: '... he [Matthew Arnold] recognizes, implicitly if not explicitly, that the Frenchman is not a Celt in the historic sense of the term.' Mr. Faverty will not have it. Triumphantly he recalls Arnold's quotation in 1872, in a review of Renan's *Réforme intellectuelle et morale de la France*, of his early line, 'France, famed in all great arts, in none supreme', but this counterstroke fails altogether if we remember Arnold's further contention that the Celt has failed 'to reach any material civilization sound and satisfying, and not out at elbows, poor, slovenly, and half-barbarous' (*Works*, v. 87). Did Arnold ever think this of the French? True, he will sometimes speak at need of the 'Latinized' or 'Gallo-Roman' Celts, but this only serves to underline the lightheartedness with which he takes up or lays down a racial theory. Mr. Faverty has forgotten Arnold's praise of 'flexibility' and, assiduous as he has been in collecting references, he has missed one instructive anecdote in *Reminiscences* (1910) by Goldwin Smith, who reminds us (p. 71) not too wildly or unfairly that Arnold's knowledge of Celtic matters 'had been formed by a few weeks at a Welsh watering-place'.

The general conclusions reached are trite. We have it confirmed that Arnold held and made use of the racial theories of his day—what others could he have held?—but held them on the whole modestly and without fanaticism. The Arnold student must be grateful to Mr. Faverty chiefly for incidental information and references—it is not too much to say that the best reading is in the notes. Two pieces of treasure-trove in connexion with *On the Study of Celtic Literature* may be pointed out: 1, Arnold's plea for a Chair of Celtic Studies, suppressed in his book and hitherto only available in the *Cornhill* (July 1866) and in E. K. Brown's unobtainable *Studies in the Text of Matthew Arnold's Prose Works* (1935), is given by Mr. Faverty (p. 217) and shown to be based on a similar plea in Renan's 'L'Instruction supérieure en France, son histoire et son avenir', which appeared in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* (May 1864); 2, certain references to Humboldt are traced (p. 227) to a series of articles by P. Challeml-Lacour in the *Revue germanique et française*—a further illustration, if needed, of Arnold's lazy preference for second-hand sources.

KENNETH ALLOTT

Con
Bo
Bo
M. la
novel
helps
virtue
to Th
piece
heart
honest
obscu
heroe
choic
hope
Conr
powe
the 'N
be sa
exper
sharp
evil b
comm
into t
good
plain
Th
the m
the n
Hewi
Conr
self f
that
thing
at eve
seems
he sai
The
badly
occasi
and S
this s
some
been
me, f

Conrad: A Reassessment. By DOUGLAS HEWITT. Pp. viii + 141. Cambridge: Bowes & Bowes, 1952. 10s. 6d.

Books on Conrad were numerous but often unhelpful before such critics as M. las Vergnas, Mr. Guerard, and Dr. Leavis began the task of disentangling the novelist from his reputation. Mr. Hewitt's short, chronologically ordered study helps us, in a lucid and unpretentious way, to discriminate between Conrad's virtues and his faults. He argues that the earlier works, from 'Heart of Darkness' to *The Secret Agent*, are the more important, and that *Nostramo* is Conrad's masterpiece. In these books, Conrad deeply perceives the equivocal nature of man's heart, his sense of guilt and of an 'indefinable compact with the "secret double"'; honesty, courage, and fidelity are questioned, and evil is something to whose obscure demand for partnership the naïve and steadfast succumb; the nautical heroes lose their bearings and are driven to realize that the world is indeed a choice, but only of nightmares: in these they must immerse themselves without hope of escape. In such later novels as *Chance* and *Victory*, Mr. Hewitt continues, Conrad repudiated these earlier perceptions, and his work consequently loses power. The signs of this loss are moralistic *naïveté* or detachment on the part of the 'Marlow' kind of narrator (whereas, in a book like *Lord Jim*, the subject 'may be said to be the relationship between the observer and the man with whose experience he is confronted') as well as the tendency to divide the characters sharply into black and white (Ricardo and de Barral; Heyst and Anthony) so that evil becomes something purely external to the hero. The imprecise rhetoric and commonplace rhythms of the later books show how the process of penetrating into the heart of darkness has been suspended. Instead, Conrad surrounds his good men with unconvincing golden mists, through which they are not very plainly seen, while the bad become mere bogies.

This study does not claim to be a complete survey of the writings; it is rather the maintenance of a thesis which other critics will have to take into account as the neatest description yet given of the change of direction in Conrad's art. Mr. Hewitt places a higher value on Conrad's perception of the ubiquity of evil than Conrad himself did, and, like Wordsworth's Solitary, he does not dissociate himself from the assumption (that of several of Conrad's disciples in our own day) that such a perception is valuable because it corresponds with the nature of things: our haughty life is crowned with darkness, there is a Gentleman Brown at every hero's elbow, and tragedy may always dissolve into mean farce. Conrad seems to have determined, like Wordsworth, to correct despondency, to bring, as he said of Turgenev, 'all problems and characters to the test of love'. Although *The Arrow of Gold* and *Chance*, with their verbalism and showiness, went badly wrong, *Victory* and *The Rover* are more successful than Mr. Hewitt's occasionally narrow criteria admit. It is these last four novels (for *The Rescue* and *Suspense*, for different reasons in each case, hardly count) that readers of this study will wish to argue about, and there are aspects of the earlier works, some of which receive altogether too summary a treatment, that might, had they been considered, have modified some parts of the verdict (Mr. Hewitt seems to me, for example, to have missed the point altogether in *Under Western Eyes*).

But from that verdict, from the view that Conrad's perceptions marched best with his artistry in the novels written before 1912 and that afterwards his ambitions as a moral fabulist outpaced his skill as a creator of incident and character, few will be able to dissent. Sometimes, however, the power of the fable operates despite inadequate or overblown expression; the fact is a mystery which no amount of justifiable—in present circumstances—insistence on 'texture' will gainsay, and it may still bring back to such a work as *Victory* even those readers who admit the justice and penetration of nearly everything that Mr. Hewitt says.

PETER URE

Die englische Sprache: ihre geschichtliche Entwicklung. Zweiter Band. **Die Flexionsformen: ihre Verwendung. Das Englische ausserhalb Europas.** By KARL BRUNNER. Pp. vi+424. Halle: Niemeyer, 1951. RM. 13; bound RM. 14.80.

With this second volume Professor Brunner completes, within the space of some 750 pages, his survey of the historical development of the English language for the use of university students. He here concerns himself mainly with the inflexions of substantives, adjectives and adverbs, numerals, pronouns and verbs, but, morphology being inseparable from syntax, he has much to say also on the evolution of sentence-patterns in modern speech. Conservative and cautious, he is nevertheless fully acquainted with the latest findings in dialectology and onomastics, and with recent advances in the appreciation of slang and the lower levels of speech. In examining and discussing minute features he never loses the sense of right perspective, and he analyses linguistic changes against their wider background of historical growth. He is unusually aware of the possibilities of external influences, Latin and French, Scandinavian and Celtic, on accidence and syntax: at the same time, he is too good a scholar to take the line of least resistance and to attribute the unexplained and the unexpected to foreign impact without corroborative evidence. He has rounded off his survey with a remarkably succinct account (pp. 345-83) of the varieties of English spoken in North America, South Africa, India, Australia, and New Zealand, and he has added copious subject and word indexes to both volumes which will enable the student to find his way about with ease.

Ranging far beyond the limits of Karl Luick's *Historische Grammatik*, upon which he inevitably relied in the previous volume, he has here covered much of the same ground as Otto Jespersen in Part VI of *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*. Indeed, much of the value of Brunner's achievement, at least to the advanced student, lies in the fact that whereas the first volume summarizes and supplements Luick, the second volume no less competently balances and corrects Jespersen. All too frequently Jespersen's lively and intrepid spirit failed to unravel with patience and calm those many knotty problems in the complex history of English which Brunner apprehends from long experience. This second volume, therefore, comprises more original matter than the first, and

its statements are more fully illustrated. Some of its illustrative examples, it is true, may sound quaint and artificial, but they serve their purpose well. Occasional departures from normal usage may be readily condoned in an erudite historical treatise of this quality. More unfortunate and more serious are the numerous misprints which disfigure this volume hardly less than the first. In the lists of corrigenda on p. 352 of the first volume and on pp. 422-3 of the second, some of the more glaring blunders in the first volume are rectified, but it is astonishing that scores of others remain unemended. For the sake of undergraduate students, for whom these books are explicitly intended, it is surely imperative that these typographical errors should be removed from future editions, not to mention other minor lapses, such as, for example, the equating of *broðorsunu* 'nephew', where the first element is manifestly dependent genitive, with *acleaf* 'oak leaf', and *heorðgeneat* 'hearth companion', where substantial components are juxtaposed (p. 29); the attribution of *hit is god godne to herianne* to Orosius instead of the Preface to Bede (p. 71); the assumption that *eahta wintra* shows rare genitive plural neuter after low numeral when it might equally well represent normal nominative plural *wintru* in a tenth-century manuscript (p. 90); the expansion of K.C. as 'King's Council' instead of 'King's Counsel' (p. 126); and the use of old-fashioned *dialectic* in the sense of *dialectal* (p. 268), of *equivalent* for *equilateral* (p. 313), and of French *appartements* for English *apartments* (p. 343).

In the meantime, however, the reader will gladly and gratefully make allowances for slight flaws in a book of such outstanding originality and competence.

SIMEON POTTER

The Oxford Dictionary of Nursery Rhymes. Edited by IONA and PETER OPIE. Pp. xxviii+467. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951. 30s. net.

Even the reviewers and readers of a learned periodical may be parents, and as a parent this reviewer offers his thanks for this admirable book. Handsomely set out, illustrated, and printed, it presents texts of 550 rhymes, including riddles, tongue-twisters, games, squibs, counting-out rhymes, folk-songs and ballads, with full and readable notes to each text and an excellent introduction. The editors' strength lies in their immense and probably unequalled knowledge of the complex bibliography of the material, in particular of the eighteenth-century printed sources. The notes on this subject and pp. 30-42 of the Introduction are of value not only to folklorists and bibliographers, but also to students of the eighteenth century: for example, the editors have increased our knowledge of the Goldsmith canon by tracing his hand in *Mother Goose's Melody* (1765 or 66?), and there are interesting references to Swift, Horace Walpole, and Burns. The editors are skilled and thorough in proving or disproving attributions of rhymes to authors, their best discussions being about Longfellow's hand in 'There was a little girl' and Mrs. Hale's in 'Mary had a little lamb'.

Nursery rhymes have received a great deal of ingenious interpretation, of which the most fantastic varieties have been the political and the mythological. Here the editors show not only learning combined with common sense but also fairness, wherever fairness is due. There are excellent folkloric notes, for

example, on 'London Bridge is broken down' and on 'Matthew, Mark, Luke and John' (or the 'White Paternoster'). All but the most insane theories are given a hearing, and a mass of scholarship is handled with charm and literary tact. The editors' general theoretical position is not quite clear: on p. 3 they tentatively support the doctrine of a *gesunkenes Kulturgut*, (i.e. that folk-lore is merely a recapitulation of the upper-class culture of previous ages), but this would seem to be contradicted by their own description of a highly primitive stratum of nursery rhymes, represented by 'Humpty Dumpty' and 'Lady-bird' (pp. 9-11, 'Germanic Equivalents'). The evidence they produce would seem to prove what scholars have found to be true of ballads and folk-tales, namely that, while much folk-lore is of recent, literary, and upper-class origin, there is still a great deal that must have been in popular tradition since very remote times.

The editors hope that 'gaps or inaccuracies . . . will be brought to our notice with gentleness': what follows is offered in that spirit. The most serious gap is the lack of any adequate description of the music with which many of the rhymes have been associated. This may distress not only amateurs of folk-song, who believe a tune to be as important as its words, but also parents, who are expected to perform. Clearly, the cost of printing even one musical setting for each of the rhymes which are definitely songs (about half) would have been prohibitive. But it should have been possible to show briefly in the notes where one can look for the tunes, if one wants to compile a musical bibliography. This has been done incompletely and haphazardly: it is sometimes vaguely said that 'this is sung to the tune of . . .', and the selective bibliographies do not always indicate whether a source gives the music or not. The note to 'Hush-a-bye Baby' mentions 'Lilliburlero' but not Purcell, while 'O can ye sew cushions', which is referred to, has a different tune. The account of the tunes of the four ballads included, 'Bessy Bell', 'Where have you been today', 'Can you make me a cambric shirt', and 'I have four sisters beyond the sea' (respectively, Child nos. 201, 12, 2, and 46) is inadequate, little attention being given to the American versions of each. This is particularly regrettable as regards Child no. 12. 'Lord Randal', which has dozens of American and English sets of tunes and words. The editors have also overlooked Barry's note in *British Ballads from Maine*: this clearly separates the 'Croodin Doo' versions, in which the dead mother learns that the child has been poisoned by the stepmother, from the other tradition of 'Lord Randal'.

The editors' procedure in setting up their 'standard text' for each rhyme is not beyond criticism. They appear not to think highly of Child's 'monumental and tedious *English and Scottish Ballads*' (p. 78: read, '*English and Scottish Popular Ballads*'), and it would have been impossible to follow Child's practice of printing the full text of every variant. Yet this work falls short of the standard set by Sargent and Kittredge in their shorter 'Child', a work of comparable scope. The editors of the *Dictionary* say they 'have chosen the version which seems to us the fullest, while bearing in mind how the rhyme is commonly known today' (p. vi). That is vague in itself and does not wholly account for the texts printed. It cannot always be seen which of the works referred to in the notes is the actual source of a standard text or of a variant given beside it: e.g. 'Bessy Bell' (pp. 71-72), where in addition there is no reference to Child, no source given for the local

tradit
lead
So
to 'I
and t
to th
carol
wort
whor

A D
M
Cl

Th
them
isms,
make
and
(194
vigor
whic
supp
clear
right
Unit
usag
crite
both
subs
The
label
merc
Scot
diale

It
the
augr
natio
time
it is
T
stock
and
of th

tradition about the song, although that is in Child, and an incomplete and misleading bibliography.

Some of the notes are inadequate in their references to general folk-lore: that to 'I had a little husband' should have mentioned the Tom Thumb of folk-tales, and that to 'Can you make me a cambric shirt' should have referred more precisely to the Clever Peasant Girl cycle; in no. 158 the Holly and Ivy refrain, typical of carols, should have been explained. In every other respect the *Dictionary* is worthy of the traditions of the Clarendon Press, and can only delight those for whom it has been produced.

M. J. C. HODGART

A Dictionary of Americanisms on Historical Principles. Edited by MITFORD M. MATHEWS. Pp. xvi+1946, in two vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1951. \$50; £12. 12s. net.

There is no finality in making dictionaries; the living language leaps ahead of them and leaves them constantly out of date. This new *Dictionary of Americanisms*, containing 50,000 entries assembled over a period of nearly seven years, makes use of the *O.E.D.* and its Supplement, of the *English Dialect Dictionary*, and more immediately of its own predecessor, the *Dictionary of American English* (1944), with which it inevitably invites comparison. Obviously with so very vigorous a language as American there was need of a supplement to a dictionary which limited its intake to the year 1900. But this work is much more than a supplement to the earlier four volumes of the *D.A.E.* Its scope and range are clearly indicated by its use of the word 'Americanism', which includes: (a) outright coinages (e.g. *appendicitis*); (b) words which first became English in the United States (e.g. *adobe*); (c) terms used in senses first given them in American usage (e.g. *faculty*, *fraternity*). The editor has thus been able to establish a criterion of admission and rejection. Close comparison with the *D.A.E.* reveals both compression and expansion, some terms being omitted altogether and others substituted, and etymologies being supplied for words in categories (a) and (b). The same critical process is applied to the *O.E.D.*, where words are sometimes labelled 'U.S.' which did not, in fact, originate there, e.g. *drummer* for commercial traveller, which seems to have been used in that sense first by Sir Walter Scott. The *E.D.D.* supplies evidence of the influence of American on English dialects.

Its purpose being to treat historically words added to the English language in the United States, this new dictionary bears impressive witness to the remarkable augmentation of the English language in America, reflecting every aspect of the national life from the early days of colonization and pioneering down to modern times (its latest citation is 1950). A comprehensive guide to American history, it is ultimately a faithful record of the American mind mirrored in its vocabulary.

The evidence of the independence of the American language from its native stock is abundantly established here and covers inventions, foreign borrowings, and slang. 'Many people of many tongues took part in shaping the language of the United States.' Current American vocabulary has absorbed words and

phrases from widely differentiated racial groups. Amongst these the most important is Spanish. The following very selective lists will, to some extent, suggest the varied range of the foreign adoptions:

Spanish: abalone, abogado, adobe, aguardiente, alameda, alcalde, arroyo, bajada, bastos, borracho, bosque, bronco, buckaroo, burro, caballero, caballo, cacique, calaboose, chaparral, cimarron, cinch, cordillera, corregidor, coyote, cuartel, dago, empresario, estancia, estufa, falda, fiesta, filibuster, fonda, frijol, gazabo, gringo, hacienda, hidalgo, hombre, jornada, ladrone, Laguna, lasso, madrona, mañana, mesa, mustang, ocotillo, olla, padre, paisano, panoche, patio, peon, pinto, plaza, poncho, pronto, pueblo, quirt, ranch(o), remuda, rio, rodeo, señor, serape, sierra, sombrero, stampedo, tamale, tornillo, tortilla, tular, vamoose, vaquero, vigilante.

French: armoire, banquette, bateau, batture, bayou, bois d'arc, bois de diable, bois de vache, boudin, bourgeois, brule, brulot, butte, cabaret, cache, cariole, cassette, cassine, chowder, coulee, coureur de bois, credit mobilier, crevasse, dalle, Indienne, lacrosse, loup-cervier, Mardi gras, patron, picayune, prairie, vachery, voyageur.

German: bergschrund, delicatessen, sauerkraut, shyster, smearcase, pretzel, wienerwurst.

Dutch: boonder, boss, bossloper, bowery, cripple, cruller, dorp, olykoek, overslaugh, Paas, Pinkster, Santa Claus, scout, scup, skipple, sleigh, snoop, stiver, stoop, vendue, waffle.

Russian: bidarka.

Irish: phony, rambunctious, and possibly dornick, shebang, slew n. 2.

Hebrew: B'nai B'rith.

Hindu: cossas.

African: buckra, obeah, voodoo, zombi and possibly tote v.

Japanese: tycoon.

American Indian: apishamore, atamasco (lily), moccasin, (high) muckamuck, mugwump, opossum, papoose, peag, pecan, pemmican, persimmon, poke, pone, potlatch, powwow, raccoon, roanoke, sachem, sagamore, sagaunash, sannup, Sequoia, skookum, skunk, squantum, squash, squaw, succotash, tepee, terrapin, toboggan, tomahawk, wahoo, wampum, and the tribal names Catawba, Cherokee, Cheyenne, Chichasaw, Chinook, Chippewa, Choctaw, etc.

It is in the fields of education, religion, politics, that American individualism is most apparent. The entry *academic freedom*, 'the freedom of a teacher to state the truth as he sees it without the fear of losing his position', is worthy of consideration in all its implications, from the quotations dated 1901 and 1947. *Coeducation, fraternity, sorority, sophomore, quiz* are terms not unknown in this country; but *pledge* n. and v. implying acceptance but not admission into a fraternity or sorority is as unfamiliar in this meaning as the system it illustrates.

The multiplication of religious sects has produced a correspondingly large vocabulary of new words and old words in new meanings:

Adventist, altar, amen corner, amen seat, anxious bench, apostle, Ascension robe, awakening, Bethlehemite, Bible communism, Bishopites, Campbellite, camp meeting, Christian Science (a model of concise and clear statement), Danite, Deseret, Destroying Angel, Disciples, Dunkard, Dunker, Episcopal Methodist,

evange
indepe
Morav
Proph
tists, S
tabern

It i
munit
here i
(The
Morm
revis
cut o
station
and th
isms a
of the
dog,
Morm
follow
Morm
are n

Th
mere
Angl
Saxo
and

Fi
with
techn
back

G. M

Line

ange

ache

mort

T

dive

alt

facu

fade

gent

evangelist, exercise, free-willer, Hard-Shell Baptist, Harmonist, Hopkinsian, independent, jerker, Josephite, Latter-Day Saint, Mennist, Methodist, Millerite, Moravian, Mormon, mourner, New Light, New School, Old School, Presbyterian, Prophet, Quaker, revival, River Brethren, Saint, Saintess, Schwenkfelder, Separatists, Seventh-Day Baptist, Shakerdom, Six Principle Baptists, Soft-Shell Baptist, tabernacle, temple, Tunker, Universalist.

It is interesting to notice how many words and phrases the Mormon community has added to the language and to compare the entry under *Mormon* here in the *Dictionary of Americanisms* with that in its predecessor, the *D.A.E.* (The word *heft* v., 'to weigh in the hand', used in this sense in *The Book of Mormon*, is omitted from both dictionaries.) The material in the *D.A.E.* is revised, rearranged, compressed, and brought up to date. Some quotations are cut out, others added. There is discrepancy in the quotation under *Mormon station* (1877) between the two dictionaries, the *D.A.E.* having 'Genoa (Utah)' and the *Dictionary of Americanisms* 'Genoa (Nev.)'. The *Dictionary of Americanisms* adds *Mormonry*, *Mormon tea*, *Mormon buggy*, *coin*, *cricket*, *tree*, lists instances of the word *Mormon* used in combinations, with *blanket*, *brake*, *country*, *cowboy*, *dog*, *empire*, *prophet*, *school*, *settlement*, *town*, *village*, cites examples where *Mormon* is the last term in combinations, e.g. *hickory Mormon*, and gives the following words as separate entries: *Mormondom*, *Mormoness*, *Mormonish*, *Mormonism*, *Mormonite*, and *Mormonize*. Of these *Mormonish* and *Mormonize* are not included in the *D.A.E.*

The word *Communism*, which has a separate entry in the *D.A.E.*, appears here merely in its indigenous brand as the last term in *Bible*, *Oneida*, *communism*. *Anglo-Saxon* n. and a. and *Anglo-Saxondom* have gone by the board, but *Anglo-Saxonize* v.tr. remains. *Anglo-phobia* is supported by quotations dated 1793 and 1944.

Fifty years of development in industry, science, and social welfare together with two world wars must mean a substantial increase of vocabulary often purely technical. The film industry alone is responsible for many terms such as *flash-back*, *Oscar*, *talkie*, *Technicolor*, *trailer*. We look in vain for *Annie Oakley*, *G. Men*, *jeep*, *Okie*, and *Teddy Bear* in the *D.A.E.*; *G.I.* appears in neither. Lines of development are indicated by such entries as *absquatulate*, *ad*, *go ahead*, *angeliferous*, *apple-sauce*, *babbitt*, *ballyhoo*, *baloney*, *beatenest*, *beautician*, *belly-ache* v., *blues*, *blurb*, *bogus*, *boost*, *grocetaria*, *missionary* v., *mitten* v., *monkey* v., *mortician*, *O.K.*, *osteopath*.

The use of old words to convey new experiences has resulted in semantic divergence:

- altar*: an enclosed area or platform immediately in front of the minister's stand or pulpit in an open-air service. Obs.
- faculty*: a body of persons responsible for the governing and the teaching in an educational institution.
- fade*: in moving pictures, to cause (a picture) to change in degree of distinctness, esp. fade in, fade out.
- gentile*: 1. Among the Mormons, a non-Mormon. 2. Among Shakers, one who is not a Shaker. Obs.

- haymaker*: a violent blow in fighting.
jump: to take possession of or occupy without legal procedure.
leg: the case or housing in which the vertical conveyor belt of a grain elevator operates; used in allusion to theatrical entertainment giving actresses opportunity for displaying their legs, as 'leg business'.
minor: a secondary subject of study.
minstrelsy: the 'Kentucky' variety.
Moderators: in Texas and elsewhere, an illegal and often criminal group. Obs.
moon: a large round biscuit. Obs.
mourner: one publicly repenting sins at a revival meeting.
muckrake: to subject (public men, corporations, &c.) to vigorous and unscrupulous charges of misconduct and corruption.
muff: in baseball, a poor player.
mug up: to eat heartily (Kipling, 1897).
music: liveliness, fun.
navigate: to move or walk.
notional: full of whims, fastidious.
nutmeg: an inhabitant of the state of Connecticut.
operate: to follow a career of crime; to engage in political machinations.
outsider: an Indian assigned to, but not remaining within the limits of, a reservation. Obs.
oven: a tomb above ground (New Orleans).
paddle: to chastise.
pin: symbol or emblem of a fraternity.
pocketbook: purse.
porridge: slush of ice or snow.
professor: in jocular or grandiose use.
promenade: college ball.
prophet: among American Indians, a religious leader; among the Mormons, Joseph Smith.
punch: to drive cattle.
puncher: a cowboy.
quiz: an oral or written examination.
robin: a large red-breasted thrush.
root: 1. to work hard. 2. to cheer.
rye: whisky.
saint: 1. (pl.) the members of the Tammany Society. Obs. 2. Mormon.
seal: to marry as a spiritual wife (Mormon).
shower: present-giving party.
star: policeman.
stiff: a rough or clumsy person, a bum or tramp.
truck: garden produce.

The criterion of inclusion, a United States origin, seems to be consistently applied. *Mixologist*, *Mose*, *to mosey*, *motorneer*, *mudhook*, *to pull mud*, *his name is mud*, *nasty* (first-class, excellent), *oiled*, *pard*, *peskily adv.*, *piker*, *plug-ugly*, *Podunk*, *punk*, *red cent*, *rip-roaring*, *ripsnorter*, *rooter*, *roughneck*, *scalawag*, *shebang*, *shucks*, *shyster*, *sissy*, *slapstick*, *snoop*, *sockdolager*, *sucker*, *teetery*, *tote*, *tux*, and the picturesque phrases *to paddle one's own canoe*, *to let rip*, *to row up Salt River*, *self-made man*, *shell out*, *keep one's shirt on*, *to shoot off one's mouth*,

not by a long shot, showdown, by a darned sight, to size up, to sling ink, to spread it on thick, to talk turkey, the whole twist and tucking, up and coming, to have a whack at, a whale of a, and many other expressions are included in the *Dictionary of Americanisms*, but *barker* n. is omitted, and so is *chore* n., together with *bundle* v. and *bundling* n., presumably because these words did not originate in the United States. *Oodles*, of wide currency in the United States and, according to the *D.A.E.*, in which it is given a separate entry, of possible Irish origin, appears in combination under *dead* 2 (9) and under *scadoodles*, supported by a quotation dated 1869. New entries include *assignment house*, 1854, 1943, and *chippy*, 1890, 1948. The many euphemisms argue a powerful Puritanism.

No lexicographer can hope to keep pace with the swift tide of colloquial speech or to reproduce the full ripeness of its flavour. The editor of the *Dictionary of Americanisms* has excluded terms for which no printed evidence was available. But he has, most adequately, fulfilled his purpose of treating historically those terms with which the founders of his nation and their descendants 'felt impelled to augment their vocabulary' and he is to be congratulated on the competence with which he has handled his material. The work is, in fact, what every sound dictionary must be in essence, an index to the history and culture of a people, a monument to the industry and zeal of those who collaborated to compile it. The use of line drawings to illustrate the definitions adds to the interest and value of the undertaking.

BEATRICE WHITE

English Miscellany. A Symposium of History, Literature and the Arts.

Edited by MARIO PRAZ. Volume II. Pp. viii+285. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura; Oxford: Parker, 1951. 9s. net.

The second issue of Professor Mario Praz's *English Miscellany* is now available. It is a distinguished periodical; and what is more, it is readable. Its scope—'a symposium of history, literature and the arts'—reflects its editor's width of interests. (A certain but not exclusive emphasis is put on subjects of English-Italian interest.) Professor Praz has the courage to print long articles; and his publishers the courage to fix a price that can be paid.

The prize this year is Mr. James Hutton's long and brilliant article with the modest title 'Some English Poems in Praise of Music'. The poems studied are of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. I believe this to be the first time that the Shakespeare—Lorenzo's speech—and the Milton texts have been properly understood. Nor is it simply a question of seeing these texts as exemplifying certain doctrines, whose history can be traced. Mr. Hutton is concerned not only with 'doctrines' but a literary form, with the evolution of a rhetorical *topos*, the *laus musicae* in relation to which the English poems are to be seen. Mr. Hutton shows how this form originates and grows, how a programme of topics is evolved, elaborated and modified: a programme that is inevitably evoked when the subject 'music' arises. This emphasis on the rhetorical form enables Mr. Hutton to avoid the errors, on the one hand, of the too simple-minded searcher for direct 'sources' and on the other of the 'historians of ideas' whose great error it is to abstract

'doctrine' from 'form', thereby destroying the literary text. Mr. Hutton gives us an admirable example of a method that must increasingly be used in our studies of Renaissance writers.

After this essay I have found most interest in F. T. Prince's 'Lycidas and the Tradition of the Italian Eclogue' and Oswald Doughty's 'Dante and the English Romantic Poets'. A relationship between 'Lycidas' and the *Canzone* has long been posited. Mr. Prince seeks to make this notion more precise. He finds the clue to Milton's pastoral elegy in the efforts of a generation of Italian poets, after Bembo, to find a vernacular diction 'capable of reproducing the complexity of Latin verse'. He uses the piscatory eclogues of Bernadino Rota for comparison. Mr. Prince is pursuing studies already initiated in this journal [cf. *R.E.S.* xxv (July 1949)]. They are obviously important; and carry the question of Milton's relationship to Italian models into the most intimate and fundamental problems of his style. After all that has been said about Milton and Italy there is still, it is clear, much to be done. Professor Doughty's long essay, smooth, rounded, readable, is the best general account I know of the various ways in which Dante was received in England in the late eighteenth century and by the Romantic poets. (Some reservations perhaps should be made about Dante's 'Platonism' or 'Neo-Platonism'.) It was probably prepared before Miss Frances Yates's exhaustive study of the history of the Ugolino episode, to which reference should be made in future, was available.

Kenneth Muir writes on 'The Jealousy of Iago', Bonamy Dobrée on 'Chesterfield in France'; there is an elegant piece by Michael Lloyd on 'Italy and the Nostalgia of George Gissing'—so elegant that the brutality of reference is not allowed to violate it; not even the title of *By the Ionian Sea* is allowed to intrude. A traveller of another sort was Thomas Coryat, on whom Piero Rebora contributes a brief note. The marked revival of interest in James Joyce (to which England has contributed little) brings an agitated essay by Jean-Jacques Mayoux on 'L'Hérésie de James Joyce' and a sensible and perhaps necessary one by Giorgio Melchiori on 'Joyce and the Eighteenth Century Novelists'. Luigi Salerno (whose useful survey of 'Seventeenth Century English Literature on Painting'—*Journal of the Warburg Institute*, xiv, 1951—may have escaped the attention of those interested in English seventeenth-century critical theory) seeks and I should say succeeds in establishing the dependence of Daniel Webb's widely circulated *Inquiry into the Beauties of Painting* on the ideas of Mengs; and Lamberto Donati contributes an amusing note on Thomas Lawrence's visit to Rome in 1819. Collectors of the curious will find a reprint of a paper by Norman Douglas 'On the Darwinian Hypothesis of Sexual Selection' which first appeared in 1895.

D. J. GORDON

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By A. MACDONALD

DURHAM UNIVERSITY JOURNAL

Vol. xiv, No. 1, December 1952

Dryden in Egypt: reflexions on *All for Love* (Norman Suckling), pp. 2-7.

E L H

Vol. xix, No. 4, December 1952

The Puritans and the reform of prose-style (Harold Fisch), pp. 229-48.

Venus, Adonis, and the horses (Robert P. Miller), pp. 249-64.

'Essence' and the *Phoenix and Turtle* (J. V. Cunningham), pp. 265-76.

Swinburne's theory of the end of art (Thomas E. Connolly), pp. 277-90.

ENGLISH STUDIES

Vol. xxxiii, No. 6, December 1952

Military newsbooks during the age of Elizabeth (Henry J. Webb), pp. 241-51.

'Christs Teares' and the literature of warning (E. D. Mackerness), pp. 251-4.

'The Knight of Malta' and Boccaccio's 'Filocolo' (Arthur Sherbo), pp. 254-7.

ÉTUDES ANGLAISES

V^e Année, N^o 4, Novembre 1952

Un cas d'ambiguïté syntactique en moyen-anglais: le type *I was wery forwanded* (Fernand Mossé), pp. 289-308.

Swift et Pascal. Note complémentaire (E. Pons), pp. 319-25.

HUNTINGTON LIBRARY QUARTERLY

Vol. xvi, No. 1, November 1952

Haley Heron: Elizabethan essayist and euphuist (Virgil B. Heltzel), pp. 1-21.

Montaigne and Shakespeare again

(Margaret T. Hodgen), pp. 23-42.

More tears for Lord Hastings (H. T. Swedenberg, Jr.), pp. 43-51.

[Publication of 1649.]

Sir Walter's last long poem (J. T. Hillhouse), pp. 53-73.

[*Harold the Dauntless*.]

MEDIUM ÆVUM

Vol. xxi, 1952

Beowulf—its unity and purpose (J. N. O'Loughlin), pp. 1-13.

Form in the *Morte Darthur* (D. S. Brewer), pp. 14-24.

Note on Anglo-Saxon Riddle 74 Erika von Erhardt-Siebold), pp. 36-37.

Two misreadings of the *Ormulum* manuscript (R. W. Burchfield), pp. 37-39.

Middle English *gawne* (C. T. Onions), p. 39.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Vol. lxxvii, No. 7, November 1952

'The Poet' an error in the Keats canon? (E. L. Brooks), pp. 450-4. Keats' sonnet 'The Poet' (Earl R. Wassermann), pp. 454-6.

Henry James's revision of *Watch and Ward* (B. R. McElderry, Jr.), pp. 457-61.

Shaw's Captain Bluntschli: a latter-day Falstaff (Robert C. Elliott), pp. 461-4.

Vol. lxxvii, No. 8, December 1952

Three notes on the text of *Beowulf* (John C. Pope), pp. 505-12.

Twey mytenes, as mete (George F. Jones), pp. 512-16.

[In *Pierce the Ploughmans Crede*.]

The *brūnecg* sword (Warren S. Walker), pp. 516-20.

The Parlement of Foules and the Pavo (Phillip W. Damon), pp. 520-4. The 'forgotten' pilgrimage in *Piers the Plowman* (David C. Fowler), pp. 524-6.

The Wanderer 98: *wyrmlicum fāh* (W. H. French), pp. 526-9.

Chaucer's 'Panik' (*Clerk's Tale*, 590) (Robert B. Pearsall), pp. 529-31.

Henry Lovelich's name (Robert W. Ackerman), pp. 531-3.

The number of the Canterbury pilgrims (Norman Nathan), pp. 533-4.

Lydgate's *The Order of Fools* in Harley MS. 374 (R. H. Bowers), pp. 534-6.

Geoffrey of Monmouth and Orosius. At third hand? (Leslie F. Smith), pp. 536-9.

Eighteen personal pronouns of the fifteenth century (Julian Ziegler), pp. 542-3.

Clough and Arnold (Paul F. Baum), pp. 546-7.

Further notes on Housman's use of the Bible (Vincent Freimarck), pp. 548-50.

How 'poetic' is A. E. Housman's poetry? (Tom Burns Haber), pp. 551-2.

Old English Aldhelm glosses (Herbert Meritt), pp. 553-4.

Old English *ent*: Icelandic *enta* (Stefán Einarsson), pp. 554-5.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

Vol. xlviii, No. 1, January 1953

Raleigh's 'hellish verses' and the 'Tragicall Raigne of Selimus' (Jean Jacquot), pp. 1-9.

The influence of La Bruyère on the 'Tatler' and the 'Spectator' (Margaret Turner), pp. 10-16.

Clopemerys (Bertram Colgrave), p. 51.

Sittingbourne and the order of 'The Canterbury Tales' (Stanley B. Greenfield), pp. 51-52.

The poets' hall called Apollo (John Buxton), pp. 52-54.

[Richard Butcher, 1620.]

MODERN PHILOLOGY

Vol. 1, No. 1, August 1952

The relationship of the three texts of *Piers the Plowman* (D. C. Fowler), pp. 5-22.

Stage settings in Shakespeare's dialogue (Warren D. Smith), pp. 32-35.

The Rhetorics in Molesworth's edition of Hobbes (Mary C. Dodd), pp. 36-42.

The revision of Newman's *Apologia* (Martin J. Svaglic), pp. 43-49.

The sun and the moon in Yeats's early poetry (Thomas Parkinson), pp. 50-58.

NEOPHILOLOGUS

36ste Jaarg., Afl. 4, 1 October 1952

The portraiture of Gabriel Harvey in the Parnassus plays and John Marston (W. Schrickx), pp. 225-34.

37ste Jaarg., Afl. 1, 1 Januari 1953

The letters of William Paston (Norman Davis), pp. 36-41.

Jacob Cats and the English Puritan marriage tradition (Rosalie L. Colie), pp. 42-50.

Two Junius problems resolved (Francesco Cordasco), pp. 53-54.

NEUPHILOLOGISCHE MITTEILUNGEN

Vol. liii, Nos. 7-8, 1952

Kubla Khan — Coleridge's fall? (James Bramwell), pp. 449-66.

NOTES AND QUERIES

Vol. cxcvii, No. 24, 22 November 1952

A poem by Carew? (R. G. Howarth), p. 518.

Dr. Johnson marks a book list (Arthur Sherbo), p. 519.

A Dryden echo in Tennyson (Robert Donald Spector), p. 520.

Vol. cxcvii, No. 25, 6 December 1952

English playwrights in the Netherland wars (Abraham B. Feldman), pp. 530-3.

A Della Cruscan poet (Sybil Rosenfeld), pp. 533-4.

Some essays by James Beattie in the 'London Magazine' (1771) (Stuart M. Tave), pp. 534-7.

Vol. cxvii, No. 26, 20 December 1952

Some notes on the vocabulary of the translation of Colonna's 'Hypnerotomachia', 1592 (Peter Ure), pp. 552-4.

Robert Southey on Thomas Adams (Cabel Flanagan), pp. 554-5.

Shakespeare and Harsnett (Kenneth Muir), pp. 555-6.

A cryptic entry in Coleridge's 'Gutch Notebook', fol. 20b (Werner W. Beyer), p. 556.

Milton in 'The Classical Tradition' (George W. Whiting), pp. 556-60.

Fielding's dinners with Doddington, 1750-1752 (Lewis M. Knapp), pp. 565-6.

Poe and Emerson (T. O. Mabbott), p. 566.

Vol. cxviii, No. 1, January 1953

Inns of Court nomenclature (D. S. Bland), pp. 2-4.

Thomas Deloney and Richard Casteler (Merritt E. Lawlis), pp. 4-7.

A source of Shakespeare's 'Lucrece' (James M. Tolbert), pp. 14-15.

Shakespeare's sonnet 51 again (A. Davenport), pp. 15-16.

A reference to Marlowe in Charles Butler's 'Principles of Musik' (1636) (Nan Cooke Carpenter), pp. 16-18.

'The Marriage of Wit and Wisdom' (Sydney Race), pp. 18-20.

Notes on 'King Lear' (A. Davenport), pp. 20-22.

Shakespeare and Italy (Barbara D. G. Steer), p. 23.

A Skeltonic passage in Ben Jonson (Cecil C. Seronsy), p. 24.

Dryden and Belinda's toilet (Cecil C. Seronsy), p. 28.

How much is a cucumber worth? (Robert S. Hunting), pp. 28-29.

[Gay's *Beggar's Opera*.]

Wordsworth, and Wilkinson's spade (G.T.), p. 31.

Bage's supposed Quaker upbringing (John H. Sutherland), pp. 32-33.

Byron's alleged part in the production of Coleridge's 'Remorse' (Dora Jean Ashe), pp. 33-36.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

Vol. xxxi, No. 3, July 1952

English literature, 1660-1800: a current bibliography (Arthur Friedman and others), pp. 225-314.

'Logical structure' in eighteenth-century poetry (D. J. Greene), pp. 315-36.

The dating of William Blake's engravings (David V. Erdman), pp. 337-43.

Fielding and the *Select Comedies of Mr. de Molière* (L. P. Goggin), pp. 344-50.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Vol. lxvii, No. 7, December 1952

Once a Week under Samuel Lucas, 1859-65 (William E. Buckler), pp. 924-41.

Longfellow's 'A Lay of Courage' (Andrew Hilen), pp. 949-59.

An unidentified criticism by Coleridge related to *Christabel* (Charles I. Patterson), pp. 973-88.

Steele and the Bishop of St. Asaph's preface (John C. Stephens, Jr.), pp. 1011-23.

A literary chestnut: Dryden's 'Cousin Swift' (Maurice Johnson), pp. 1024-34.

Milton's alleged Ramism (P. Albert Duhamel), pp. 1035-53.

The precarious balance of John Marston (Samuel Schoenbaum), pp. 1069-78.

Shakespeare's romantic comedies (Karl F. Thompson), pp. 1079-93.

Chaucer's colloquial English: its structural traits (Margaret Schlauch), pp. 1103-16.

The Clerk's endlink in the *d* manuscripts (Albert E. Hartung), pp. 1173-77; reply by Germaine Dempster, pp. 1177-81.

That 'two-handed engine' finally? (Esmond L. Marilla), pp. 1181-4.
Clough's 'The Struggle': the text, title, and date of publication (Francis G. Townsend), pp. 1191-2.

RIVISTA DI LETTERATURE MODERNE

Anno iii, No. 3, Luglio-settembre 1952

Die geistige Welt Lord Byrons (Siegfried Korninger), pp. 194-208.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY

Vol. xlix, No. 4, October 1952

Four Old English cryptographic riddles (Norman E. Eliason), pp. 553-65.

Swift as historian (John Robert Moore), pp. 583-604.

Polonius, Hamlet, and Lear in Aaron Hill's *Prompter* (W. O. S. Sutherland, Jr.), pp. 605-18.

Whitman's knowledge of Shakespeare (Floyd Stovall), pp. 643-69.

STUDIES IN ENGLISH, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

Vol. xxxi, 1952

Materials for a new edition of the Chaucer life-records (Martin M. Crow), pp. 1-12.

The rebellion of the kings in Malory and in the Cambridge *Suite du Merlin* (Robert H. Wilson), pp. 13-26.

Sir John Salisbury as Spenser's Timias (Charles H. Green), pp. 27-34.

The composition of *Macbeth* with reference to Holinshed (Robert Adger Law), pp. 35-41.

The Hesperian gardens in Milton (D. T. Starnes), pp. 42-51.

Pope on the art of gardening (R. H. Griffith), pp. 52-56.

Byron's focus of revision in his composition of *Don Juan* (Guy Steffan), pp. 57-67.

Swinburne vs. Furnivall. A case study in 'Aesthetic' vs. 'Scientific' criticism (Oscar Maurer), pp. 86-96.

The genesis of 'The Recessional' (A. W. Yeats), pp. 97-108.

The Hamlet of Stephen Dedalus (William Pecoy), pp. 109-19.

[U
Ann
an
A
V
H
23
ARM
PI
C
BAK
39
BEN
14
33
BER
A
2
BIB
01
56
P
50
BR
10
BRO
11
2
BRO
X
S
BRU
C
BRV
p
CH
I
a
CH
d
F
2
CH
A
CL
T
3
CO
I
CR
o
P
CR
P
5

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

July-December 1952

[Unless otherwise stated, London is the place and 1952 the date of each publication.]

- Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature. Vol. xxii, 1941. Ed. A. Macdonald and L. N. Broughton. Vol. xxiii, 1942. Ed. A. Macdonald and H. J. Pettit, Jr. Cambridge. pp. xvi + 235; xvi + 154. 21s.; 25s.
- ARMSTRONG, A. M., and others. The Place-Names of Cumberland. Part III. Cambridge. pp. lxxx + 458-565. 18s.
- BAKER, H. The Wars of Truth. pp. xii + 390. 35s.
- BENNETT, H. S. English Books & Readers 1475 to 1557. Cambridge. pp. xiv + 337. 35s.
- BERNHEIMER, R. Wild Men in the Middle Ages. Cambridge, Mass. pp. xvi + 224. 25s.
- BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE. Catalogue des ouvrages de William Shakespeare conservés au Département des Imprimés. Paris, 1948. pp. viii + 424 columns. 500 fr.
- BRITISH ACADEMY. Proceedings, vol. xxxv, 1949. pp. xii + 274. 42s.
- BROOKS, C., and R. P. WARREN. Fundamentals of Good Writing. pp. xvi + 523. 25s.
- BROWN, C. (ed.). Religious Lyrics of the XIVth Century, 2nd edn. revised G. V. Smithers. Oxford. pp. xxiv + 365. 15s.
- BRUFORD, W. H. Literary Interpretation in Germany. Cambridge. pp. 48. 2s. 6d.
- BRYANT, A. Literature and the Historian. pp. 24. 3s.
- CHAPMAN, R. W. (ed.). Jane Austen's Letters, 2nd edn. pp. xlv + 515 + Notes and Indexes. 42s.
- CHAUCER, G. Troilus and Criseyde Rendered into Modern English Prose by R. M. Lumiansky. Columbia. pp. xii + 217. \$5.00.
- CHRISTOPHERSEN, P. The Ballad of *Sir Aldingar*. Oxford. pp. x + 258. 30s.
- CLIFFORD, J. L. Hester Lynch Piozzi (Mrs. Thrale), 2nd edn. Oxford. pp. xx + 493. 35s.
- COOPER, L. Certain Rhythms in the English Bible. Ithaca, N.Y. pp. viii + 16. 5s.
- CRAIGIE, Sir W. A. A Memoir and a List of . . . Published Writings. Oxford. pp. 38. 6s.
- CRASNOFF, V. N. The Case of the Lost Postulate. New York, 1951. pp. 22. 50c.
- DANBY, J. F. Poets on Fortune's Hill. pp. 212. 18s.
- DAVIS, M. R. Melville's *Mardi*. New Haven. pp. xvi + 240. 25s.
- DAY, MABEL (ed.). The English Text of The Ancræn Riwle (Cotton MS. Nero A. XIV). pp. xxiv + 196. 25s.
- DECKER, C. R. The Victorian Conscience. New York. pp. 213. \$3.00.
- DONNE, J. The Divine Poems, ed. H. Gardner. Oxford. pp. xcvi + 147. 25s.
- DOWNER, A. S. (ed.). English Institute Essays 1951. New York. pp. viii + 221. 20s.
- DUDDEN, F. H. Henry Fielding, 2 vols. Oxford. pp. xii + 1183. 105s.
- FLASDIECK, H. M. Zinn und Zink. Tübingen. pp. xvi + 180. DM. 24.
- GALLUP, D. T. S. Eliot. A Bibliography. pp. xii + 177. 25s.
- GERRITSEN, J. (ed.). The Honest Mans Fortune. Groningen. pp. cxii + 188. Glds. 12.90.
- GOKAK, V. K. The Poetic Approach to Language. pp. xii + 247. 25s.
- GORDON, I. A. (ed.). Shenstone's Miscellany 1759-1763. Oxford. pp. xx + 164. 21s.
- GRATTAN, J. H. G. and C. SINGER. Anglo-Saxon Magic and Medicine. pp. xii + 234. 28s.
- HÄUSERMANN, H. W. The Genevese Background. pp. x + 224. 18s.
- HARDY, T. Our Exploits at West Pooley. pp. viii + 110. 9s. 6d.
- HERMODSSON, L. Reflexive und intransitive Verba im älteren Westgermanischen. Uppsala. pp. 347. Sw. Kr. 15.
- HEKTER, J. H. More's *Utopia*. The Biography of an Idea. Princeton, N.J. pp. xii + 171. 20s.
- HOGAN, C. B. Shakespeare in the Theatre 1701-1800. A Record of Performances in London 1701-1750. Oxford. pp. xiv + 517. 42s.
- HUGHES, E. North Country Life in the Eighteenth Century. pp. xxii + 435. 30s.
- ISER, W. Die Weltanschauung Henry Fieldings. Tübingen. pp. 320. DM. 24.
- JACK, I. Augustan Satire. Oxford. pp. x + 163. 18s.
- JACOBS, W. D. William Barnes, Linguist. Albuquerque. pp. 87. \$1.00.

- JENKINS, H. Edward Benlowes (1602-1676). pp. xii+371. 35s.
- JOHNSON, S. The Letters, ed. R. W. Chapman. Oxford. 3 vols. pp. xxxviii+452; viii+531; viii+477. 126s. the set.
- JONES, H. M. The Bright Medusa. Urbana. pp. x+98. \$2.50.
- JONES, H. W. and A. WHITWORTH. Thomas Sprat 1635-1713, Bishop of Rochester. Check List [cyclostyled]. No pagination. No price given.
- JONSON, B. Works, ed. C. H. Herford, Percy and Evelyn Simpson, vol. xi. Oxford. pp. viii+668. 42s.
- KLIGER, S. The Goths in England. Cambridge, Mass. pp. viii+304. 32s. 6d.
- KNIGHT, D. Pope and the Heroic Tradition. New Haven, 1951. pp. x+123. 20s.
- KNIGHT, G. W. Lord Byron: Christian Virtues. pp. xvi+304. 30s.
- LEWIS, W. S. (ed.). The Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's Correspondence, vols. xv and xvi. New Haven, 1951. pp. liv+395; xxvi+439. 80s. each.
- MILLS, L. J. (ed.). *Senilis Amor*. Bloomington. pp. vi+167. \$2.50.
- MILTON, J. The Poetical Works, vol. i. Paradise Lost, ed. H. Darbishire. Oxford. pp. xxviii+326. 30s.
- MITCHELL, C. (ed.). Hogarth's Peregrination. Oxford. pp. xxxii+53. 15s.
- MOLLOY, J. J. A Theological Interpretation of the Moral Play *Wisdom, Who Is Christ*. Washington, D.C. pp. xviii+225. No price given.
- MORTON, A. L. The English Utopia. pp. 230. 18s.
- MUDRICK, M. Jane Austen. Princeton, N.J. pp. xii+267. 32s. 6d.
- MUNBY, A. N. L. The Family Affairs of Sir Thomas Philipps. Cambridge. pp. xiv+119. 15s.
- NATIONAL BOOK LEAGUE. Shakespeare. pp. 32. 1s. 6d.
- NICKALLS, J. L. (ed.). The Journal of George Fox [revised edn.]. Cambridge. pp. 1+789. 21s.
- NICOLL, A. A History of English Drama 1660-1900. 3 vols. Cambridge. pp. viii+462; viii+467; vi+423. 35s. each.
- OWINGS, M. A. The Arts in the Middle English Romances. New York. pp. 204. \$3.50.
- OXFORD BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY. Publications, N.S., vol. iv, 1950. Oxford. pp. 60. No price given.
- PAPAJEWSKI, H. Die Welt-, Lebens- und Kunstanschauung William Somerset Maughams. Köln. pp. 221. DM. 15.
- PASSMORE, J. A. Hume's Intentions. Cambridge. pp. x+164. 18s.
- POGSON, R. Miss Horniman and the Gaiety Theatre, Manchester. pp. xvi+216. 21s.
- PRATOR, C. H., Jr. Language Teaching in the Philippines. U.S. Educational Foundation in the Philippines, 1950. pp. iv+96. No price given.
- PRINS, A. A. French Influence on English Phrasing. Leyden. pp. viii+320. Fl. 20.
- RAIZISS, S. The Metaphysical Passion. Philadelphia. pp. xvi+327. 40s.
- RAMSAY, R. L. Our Storehouse of Missouri Place Names. Columbia, Miss. pp. 160. No price given.
- RAY, G. N. The Buried Life. pp. vi+148. 12s. 6d.
- RENNICK, W. L. Edmund Spenser. Cambridge. pp. 21. 2s. 6d.
- ROBERTS, S. C. Thomas Gray of Pembroke. Glasgow. pp. 31. 3s. 6d.
- RÖHRMAN, Dr. H. Marlowe and Shakespeare. Arnheim. pp. viii+109. No price given.
- SAMPSON, G. English for the English. New edn. Cambridge. pp. xx+129. 10s. 6d.
- SCHMITZ, R. M. Pope's Windsor Forest 1712. Saint Louis. pp. iv+70. \$4.50.
- SHAKESPEARE, W. King Lear, ed. K. Muir. pp. lxiv+256. 18s.
- Troilus and Cressida. First Quarto, 1609. Introductory note by W. W. Greg. pp. viii+no pagination. 25s.
- THOMPSON, L. Melville's Quarrel with God. Princeton, N.J. pp. viii+475. 40s.
- TIMMER, B. J. (ed.). Judith. pp. viii+55. 5s.
- WALLACE, M. W. English Character and the English Literary Tradition. Toronto. pp. x+78. 28s.
- WILLIAMS, A. (ed.). A Tribute to George Coffin Taylor. Chapel Hill. pp. xviii+213. 40s.
- WILLIAMS, Sir H. The Text of *Gulliver's Travels*. Cambridge. pp. viii+94. 21s.
- WORDSWORTH, W. The Poetical Works, ed. E. de Selincourt, vol. ii (2nd edn.). Oxford. pp. xii+548. 30s.

BACK COVER MISSING